TREATISE ON SLAVERY.

IN WHICH IS SHOWN FORTH

THE EVIL OF SLAVEHOLDING

BOTH

FROM THE LIGHT OF NATURE AND DIVINE REVELATION.

BY JAMES DUNCAN.

Columbia, speak; let SLAVERY's dirge be sung
Wide o'er the world, the joyful sound begun:
Shall bid the age of crime and suffering cease,
And hail the dawn of freedom and of peace.

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."—MATT. vii. 12.

VEVAY:
PRINTED AT THE 'INDIANA REGISTER' OFFICE.
1824.

CINCINNATI:
RE-PUBLISHED BY
THE CINCINNATI ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
MAIN STREET, BETWEEN 4TH AND 5TH.
1840.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE NEW-YORK EDITION.

The author of this work was the Rev. James Duncan, a learned and faithful minister of the Gospel in Indiana, and father of the Hon. Alexander Duncan, now member of Congress from Cincinnati. It is a matter of regret, that a letter from the West, containing some further particulars respecting the author and his labors, has been mislaid and cannot be found. However, the work will speak for itself, wherever it shall be read, and will show its author to have been a man of uncommon powers of reasoning, and of uncommon clearness of vision, for his day, on the subject of slavery and abolition. The work was first published, as the title imports, at Vevay, in the state of Indiana, in the year 1824, and was accompanied by the following

RECOMMENDATION :

This treatise has been highly recommended by several gentlemen of Kentucky and Indiana—the publisher selects, for the present, the following letter from Jesse L. Holman, Esq. one of the judges of the supreme court of Indiana, a gentleman well known to the citizens of this and the neighboring States.

"I have been favored, for a few hours, with the manuscript of a 'Treatise on Slavery,' by the Rev. James Duncan, and from a hasty perusal of the greater part of its contents, and the well known abilities of the author, I conceive it to be executed with a depth of thought and force of argument, that well deserves the attention of all inquirers after moral truth, and justly merits the patronage of the public."

(Signed) Jesse L. Holman.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Of the moral law. 7
Of the law of nature. 8

CHAPTER I.

1. Slavery defined. 13
Appendages of Slavery, 14.

CHAPTER II.

2. History of servitude. 15
The Antediluvians, 15—Nimrod, 16—Abraham, ib.—Egypt, 17—Jewish, 18—The Golden Rule, 21—The Gibeonites, 23.

CHAPTER III.

3. Slaveholding a heinous sin. 25
The Moral Law, 25—Moral Law Contradictory, 27—God's Great End, ib.—Requires Sin to Sustain it, 28—Obstructs the Means of Grace, 29—Against Natural Rights, 30—Against Relative Duties, 31—The First Commandment, 32—The Second Commandment, 33—The Third Commandment, 35—The Fourth Commandment, 36—The Fifth Commandment, 37—The Sixth Commandment, 39—The Seventh Commandment, 41—The Eighth Commandment, 42—The Ninth Commandment, 47—The Tenth Commandment, 48—The Right of all Men to the World, 49—Against Mercy to the Poor, 51—Opposed to Republicanism, 53—Hurtful to Masters and Slaves, 54—Brings National Judgments, 59—At War with the Church, 60—Makes God a Slave, 63—Unjust towards God, 65—Against Infant Baptism, 66—Against all Laws, Divine and Human, 67—Produces

Partiality in Trials, 68—Violates the Rights of Conscience, 69—Will not admit of Prayer, 73—The Slaveholder's Prayer, 76—Hinders the Success of the Gospel, 78.

CHAPTER IV.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF SLAVERY. 79

CHAPTER V.

THE ARGUMENTS FROM SCRIPTURE. 87

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST. 94

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE DUTY OF A SLAVE TO HIS MASTER. 97

CHAPTER IX.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF SLAVERY. 103

CHAPTER X.

OF THE REAL CONDITION OF SLAVEHOLERS IN RELATION TO THE JUSTICE OF GOD. 105

CHAPTER XI.

OF THE DUTY OF CHRISTIANS RELATIVE TO SLAVERY. . . 107

Soliloquy for a Dying Slaveholder, 115.

CHAPTER XII.

PRACTICAL IMPROVEMENT. 118

Gradualism, 123—Conclusion, 124—The Negro, 126.

APPENDIX.

Laws of Kentucky and Virginia relative to Slavery, 128—Reply to Mr. Harris, 133—A Method Proposed to prevent any Dangerous Consequences from a General Emancipation of the Slaves, 135—Note, 136.

PREFACE.

THE object of the present work, is not so much to render obnoxious the cruel treatment of slaves, as to discuss the principle of slaveholding, and to show forth the iniquity of the practice. The cruel treatment of slaves has been often exposed to public view, by many able hands, who have also by judicious arguments refuted the most specious apologies that have been advanced in favor of the principle. Yet, that the principle or moral ground upon which slavery is practiced in the world, has been too lightly touched by modern writers, is manifest from two concessions, which most of them appear to admit. The first is, that slavery was authorized by the judicial law under the Old Testament. The second is, that the emancipation of slaves need not to be sudden, but gradual, lest the possessors of them should be too much impoverished, and lest the free inhabitants might be exposed to danger, if the blacks were all liberated at once.

If the first of these concessions is admitted as just, namely, that if slavery in its present form was allowed of under the Old Testament, the practice may be defended under the New, because every precept of the judicial law, must have had the moral law for its basis, so as in no respect to contradict it. If then slavery in its present form was morally just under the Old Testament, it must be just under the New, for the moral law is as unchangeable as God himself.

If the second of these concessions is just, to wit: the emancipation of slaves ought not to be sudden, but gradual, to prevent the penal evils of poverty and other distresses which might accrue to the inhabitants in general; it will go to justify the practice of slaveholding, because the only motive that men can have to practice slavery, is that it may be a means of preventing poverty and other penal evils. If the fear of poverty or any penal sufferings will exculpate the possessors of slaves from blame, for a few months or years, it will do it for life; and if some may be lawfully held to labor without wages, all may be

held the same way ; and if the principle of slavery is morally wrong, it ought not to be practiced to avoid any penal evil, but if just, even the cruel treatment of slaves would not condemn the practice. The subject then which at this time calls forth the utmost exertions of the friends of humanity, is the great criminality of slaveholding, or to shew the extreme guilt of that man who occupies the office and station of a slaveholder although he should treat his slaves with the utmost humanity as slaves. Agreeable to these remarks, the following treatise will be introduced with an inquiry concerning the moral law, considered as the law of nature, which binds all men to act conformably to its precepts, and condemns every practice or habit, that is not in every respect agreeable to its dictates. Then, in order to prepare the subject for an impartial examination, will be given a definition of slavery, with a delineation of the office and power of a slaveholder. If any reader should feel disposed to call in question the correctness of those definitions, let him suspend his judgment till he turns over to the appendix at the close of this work, where he will find some extracts from the laws of Kentucky and Virginia relative to slaves, which will prove those definitions to be perfectly correct.

This attempt to overthrow the principle of slavery will consist of some abstract demonstrations, and some plain scriptural arguments. Those of the abstract kind will be twenty-nine in number, every one of which, it is hoped, if carefully examined, will be found to be conclusive. One argument, if fair and just, is sufficient to establish a position, with an enlightened and unprejudiced mind ; but when we consider that many readers are the opposite of both, a subject may be of that importance, as to require all the collective force of argumentation that can be mustered to lead such to conviction. As the subject of slavery is of the highest importance, and deeply concerns the temporal and eternal states of men, it merits the greatest attention, and will call for a proportional degree of demonstration, both from scripture and abstract principles, to convince the guilty of its criminality.

The design of this work is to persuade all that are engaged in the business of holding their fellow creatures in a state of unmerited involuntary slavery, that they are guilty of a crime, not only of the highest aggravation, but one, that if persisted in, will inevitably lead them to perdition.

INTRODUCTION.

In attempting to justify or condemn any act or practice, it cannot be amiss, in the first instance, to ascertain whether the matter of the thing required or forbidden, is moral or indifferent. If it is moral, it cannot be optional with us either to do it or not. For example: speaking truth is moral and not indifferent, therefore it cannot be optional with us to either speak truth or falsehood; but the moral law binds us to speak truth, every man to his neighbor. If the matter of the thing be indifferent, as that of eating certain kinds of food, it may be either right or wrong, according to the circumstances. If the practice of slaveholding is of a moral nature, and not indifferent, the rule by which we are to judge of it must be the moral law, and not either human laws, customs, habits, temporal ease, peace or safety. That slaveholding, whether right or wrong, is moral and not indifferent, there can be no dispute; every person, then, who is seriously disposed to know his duty relative to the practice, will compare it with the moral law, and form his judgment by that unerring rule; and any one attempting to investigate the subject, with a design to either justify or condemn it, must take the moral law for his chief guide. This method we shall adopt; that is, to open up the nature of the moral law, and lay it down as the foundation or rock upon which we purpose the following scheme of argumentation shall rest.

OF THE MORAL LAW.

The great end for which God made man was, that he should glorify God and enjoy him forever. By God's end in making man, we are to understand the proper motive to which he directed him by his law, and made it his indispensable duty and great privilege to attain.

The rule which God gave to man when he created him, and which still binds him to glorify and enjoy him forever, is called the moral law. The moral law is a transcript of the divine character; it forbids all sin, as being contrary to the holy nature of God, and binds all men to the performance of every duty relating to God, and every duty relating to men.

OF THE LAW OF NATURE.

The moral law is called the law of nature, because it originated in the will of God, was made known to man in his primitive state by a divine impression of it on his soul, and revealed in the great book of nature, which book of nature is no other than God's works of creation and providence, representing to the minds of mankind the relations in which they stand to God as his dependent creatures, and the various relations in which they stand to one another; all which show forth the will of God as a rule that binds mankind to perform all relative duties which they owe to God, and all relative duties which they owe to one another. For example—God's creating us, his preserving us, and giving us rain and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness, are moral reasons why we should glorify his name. And the relations of husbands and wives, parents and children, show the reciprocal obligations such persons are under to perform relative duties; and the necessary dependence of mankind upon one another as equals, for mutual protection, lays them under obligations to afford mutual protection to one another.

The moral law made known to man in the book of nature, and more perfectly in the volume of Divine revelation, corresponds exactly with the relations which God has established between himself and his creatures, and with all the relations which he has established among his creatures; yea, these relations are so essential to the existence of moral obligations, that they are the very foundation of it; so that God's word as a written rule, when it requires duties that are purely moral, binds mankind only to the performance of such duties as arise out of these relations. Neither would it be consistent with the Divine character to require any acts of obedience from his creatures, which would contradict these relations that he has established. God has a sovereign right to form new relations, which might occasion new obligations to duty;—but no new relations made to exist, and authorised by God, will ever be allowed to destroy or counteract the natural relations which he has already established, or to prevent the duties which arise from them. If the relations which God has made to exist between himself and his creatures were to cease, and all those which he has made to exist among his creatures were dissolved, all moral obligation would be at an end. Every sin or criminal act of any subject of the moral law, is an attempt to destroy some one or more of these relations; to prevent which, civil penalties have been appointed, and although such penalties do in some instances dissolve natural relations, yet the ultimate end of such penalties is to protect the innocent in the peaceable enjoyment of them.

The fall of man occasioned a new relation to exist among mankind, which is that between civil rulers and their subjects. The ultimate end of civil government is the suppression of vice and the protection of the innocent, or in other words, to establish and defend these relations which subsist between God and his creatures, and the natural relations which exist among his creatures, but in no respect to change or dissolve them.

So sure as God has established these immutable relations, and has obliged his creatures to act agreeable to his will in their several relations, he must have granted inalienable rights to them, corresponding with their several relations and reciprocal obligations to duty; as the right to worship and serve God without being hindered by man, or any human authority. and the right of all conjugal, parental, and filial duties. Therefore, every law of man that contravenes those relations, and intercepts the right of doing any of those duties which naturally arise out of these relations, must be at war with the rights of man, and in open rebellion against the law of God.

Civil power in the hands of civil rulers, where they are not usurpers, is delegated to them from the people, who are the proper constituents of civil government. The people, prior to that delegation, have a right as individuals, and unorganised, to suppress crimes by punishing the guilty and protecting the innocent; but those duties, which would be very inconvenient for them to do in an unorganised state, or in their individual capacity, they, in constituting a civil government, delegate to representatives to perform in their name. But in this delegation they do not relinquish their rights, but only employ agents to do for them what would be inconvenient to do themselves.

The general rights of men may be distinguished into two classes. 1. Such as are capable of delegation. 2. Such as are incapable. Those rights which are capable of delegation, are the rights of protecting the innocent and punishing the guilty. These rights which are incapable of delegation are these private rights which have been defined, the defence and protection of which is the proper *end* of civil government; such as the right to serve God agreeable to his will, and according to the relations in which they stand to him, and the rights of private relative duties which they owe to one another, as the duties of husbands to wives, and wives to husbands, parents to children, and children to parents. Mankind cannot delegate to representatives or to others their own rights of duty to God, nor their own right to perform those private relative duties that they owe to one another, which have been described. If mankind, then, have no power to delegate to others their private rights, it would be still more unreasonable to attempt to delegate from their children the same rights, and equally unreasonable to attempt it with others that are not their children or descendants. Therefore, all mankind have an inalienable right to serve God accord-

ing to the relation in which they stand to him, and an inalienable right to do all relative duties to one another, without being hindered by any human authority, which rights imply all the characteristics of freemen, considered as subjects of civil government. In contending for freedom, in opposition to slavery, we design to plead for no more than those rights of duty to God, and rights of relative duties which mankind owe to one another.

These views of the rights of man, are by no means at variance with a man's right to transfer to another his personal freedom, as respects his labor, for a time, or for life, which any man may sell as well as his other property, but it will condemn any attempt to sell his right of duty to God, or any private relative duties which he owes to mankind, both of which are inalienable.

QUERY.—Whether the civil law of any government can be the supreme rule of duty?

ANSWER.—The supreme rule of duty must be the moral law, but not the civil law, neither ought civil requisitions to be regarded, if found to be contrary to the moral law. If the civil law was the supreme rule, it would not admit the moral law to have any authority, further than it might be made subservient to the civil law.

2. It would suppose a people prior to their political constitution, or to the existence of civil law among them, to be without law; and that the representatives of a nation, while framing a constitution, and making laws to be above and out of the reach of all law, both divine and human, so as to have no moral rule to bind them, to make the constitution and laws good and just.

3. It would suppose the people to be obliged to adopt that constitution, and submit to the laws, however cruel and tyrannical.

4. It would suppose every constitution and laws, made by representatives, to be perfectly just, and the representatives themselves to be infallible men, for as sure as we admit a civil rule to be wrong, it supposes a law of higher authority which denounces it wrong. Or if we admit that representatives are fallible men, it supposes a law that they are liable to transgress in instituting civil laws, which can be none other than the moral law. Therefore the civil law cannot be the supreme rule of duty to any people, but the supreme rule of duty is the moral law, which is before every law, and is that eternal and unchangeable rule, which is binding upon all men, to which every human law ought to be conformed, or else it is sinful. Says Cicero—"There is not one moral law for Rome, another for Athens, and another for Sparta, but one moral law is equally binding on all nations."

These fundamental principles being laid down, we shall attempt an investigation of the subject proposed.

SLAVERY.

In discussing this subject it will be proper,

I. To define slavery.

II. To give a brief history of servitude in general.

III. Show, by a course of argumentation, that slave-holding is condemned by the word of God, and contrary to the law of nature; and,

IV. Try to point out the duty of both emancipators and others in relation to the practice.

CHAPTER I.

I. SLAVERY DEFINED.

By slavery we do not intend such servants as might voluntarily bind or indenture themselves for any term, or for life, nor the subjects of kings or princes, who are frequently called servants, nor such servants as might bind themselves for any term; nor do we intend soldiers, who are often called servants, nor those who may have been or may be condemned for certain crimes and sold for servants, nor those who might have agreed to have been sold for a term of years, to pay their passage from one country to another, nor such as were taken prisoners in war and sold for slaves during life, which it appears was customary in ancient eastern countries, and among the

Greeks were called servants under the yoke. But by slavery, we mean that of involuntary, unmerited, perpetual, hereditary slavery, without any conditions or limitations, or supposed crimes to be a legal cause for that involuntary slavery. By slaves we mean such beings of the human race as are, with their offspring, to perpetual generations, considered as PROPERTY; compelled by superior force, unconditionally to obey their owners, liable to be given and received; to go and to come; to marry or forbear; to be separated when married; to eat, drink, sleep, labor, and be beaten at the discretion of their masters; this is slavery.

With slaveholders we do not class all that have the persons of slaves in their power, for some have them that are making conscience of educating them, and are disposed at some future time to set them at liberty. Others may not have come to a full discovery of the sin of holding slaves, yet are laying their minds open to conviction, and are striving, by reading, meditation, and prayer, to know their duty relative to the business of slavery. A real slaveholder is one who not only has the persons of slaves in his power, but has a full determination to retain them in bondage, and to bequeath them and their posterity to his succeeding heirs. By a slaveholder we mean one who has a power, without any control of man, to contravene all the preceptive obligations of the divine law relative to the slave, to intercept and prevent all the relative duties which he owes to God and to his relations and neighbors. In short, it is a power over all those private inalienable rights and relative duties, which no civil authority upon earth has either a right to tolerate or prevent. It is no just objection to this definition of a slaveholder's power, that the laws of some slave states will punish the man who kills his slave, because the same law admits him to exercise all that unlimited power which has been described, while the slave is alive, but takes no cognizance of his case till after he is killed.

APPENDAGES OF SLAVERY.

There are three things which are not in every possible case essential to the being of slavery, yet are essential to

its permanent existence, and to the stability of that government which authorises slavery. The first is, that the slaves must be kept in a state of ignorance of every species or branch of literature, to prevent them from being able to plead their right to freedom, and to prevent them from contriving any successful methods to escape from bondage.

The second is, the necessity of all slaves being outlawed, or excluded from the privilege of bearing testimony in any court, for or against any free man. This lays them open to all possible abuses which human depravity might suggest, and in particular subjects the female slaves to the lawless will of the master, to become his prostitutes at discretion.

The third thing is, that in the economy of slavery, no respect can, in ordinary cases, be had to any relation, nor to private relative duties; but the authority of the master comes in prior to any relative obligation. Though some masters may permit their slaves to live with their relations, and allow them the exercise of some relative duties, yet all these rights and privileges are liable to be suspended at the discretion of the master.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF SERVITUDE.

II. A brief history of servitude.

THE ANTEDILUVIANS.

The first intimation of slavery is in Genesis vi. 11. "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." The business of slavery is not here mentioned, but it seems to be implied in the general expression. The earth was filled with violence, which is again repeated in the 13th verse. Violence signifies a forcible usurpation of power over the rights of others, which may imply either the right of property, or liberty, or both. As slavery is the highest degree of usurpation, and violence was the crying sin of that age, we have good

reason to believe that it was one capital ingredient of that enormous guilt which brought upon them the greatest stroke of divine vengeance that ever befel the human race since the fall of Adam.

NIMROD.

The next intimation is in Gen. x. 8. "And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said, even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord: and the beginning of his kingdom was Babel," &c. Nimrod is not here literally termed a slaveholder; but he is represented as a cruel tyrant, whose business was that of hunting and enslaving mankind, even as slave traders do the Africans.

ABRAHAM.

In the history of Abraham, we have accounts of servants, but no account of slaves. Gen. xiv. 14. "He armed his trained servants, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen." That these were not slaves, but only common servants, is evident from their being trained to the use of arms, which was quite inconsistent with the condition of slavery.

Secondly. The age of Abraham was so recent a period from the universal deluge, that mankind were not all organized into political governments; so that patriarchal government was then necessary, which was no other than that of the great and wealthy presiding over, governing and defending such of the poorer class as were disposed to put themselves under their protection, to be their safeguard against lawless bands which might be disposed to live by plunder. That Abraham was one of those patriarchal rulers is evident from ch. xxiii. 6. "Hear us, my lord, thou art a mighty prince among us; in the choice of thy sepulchres bury thy dead." This may be compared with the history of Job, as another example of patriarchal government, chapter xvii. Abraham was commanded to circumcise all born in his house, or bought with his money: but this command, instead of recognizing the lawfulness of slaveholding, is pointedly against it. It first

supposes it lawful to purchase men for servants, which under peculiar circumstances is always lawful. 2d. Instead of riveting the chains of involuntary, unmerited, hereditary slavery upon them, they were to be circumcised, and thereby made members of the same church with their masters, and so made to have a right to the same privileges, both civil and ecclesiastical, which belonged to the Jews; one of which was exemption from a state of slavery; and this covenant obligation upon Abraham and his posterity to perpetual generations, absolutely precluded perpetual hereditary slavery from ever existing in the Jewish nations.

EGYPT.

The next account we have in scripture of servitude was that of Israel's bondage in Egypt, which was not complete slavery, neither was it to be compared to that which is practised in these United States, or in the West Indies. The Israelites were subject to cruel oppression in Egypt, but they had the privilege of residing on their own premises in the land of Goshen; and of domestic comfort with their own families, without being sold and scattered far away from each other. They also had their own individual property, as flocks and herds, and meat and drink in abundance, as appeared from their murmurings and expressions of regret for leaving the land of Egypt. Exodus xvi. 3. "And the children of Israel said unto them, would to God that we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh pots, and where we had bread to the full." This was said on the fifteenth day of the second month, after they left Egypt, so that it was a matter fresh in their memories. Their bondage did not consist in being the private property of individuals throughout the nation, but in being subject to the arbitrary power of a tyrant, who had dominion over their bodies and lives at his pleasure; and although he did not hold them all at once in a state of actual servitude, yet he had carried on a constant practice of levying a tribute of laborers from among them, to be employed in mortar and brick, and in building store cities for Pharaoh, and were liable to be beaten and abused while employed in the service of the

public. These, together with the murder of their male children for a time, were the principal ingredients of that bondage which Israel suffered in Egypt, which all taken together were less intolerable than that complete slavery which is now practised in the United States.

JEWISH.

The next account of servitude is in Leviticus xxv. 44–46. "Both thy bondmen and bondmaids which thou shalt have shall be of the heathen that are round about you, of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you which they begat in your land, and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever." From this citation it is evident that servitude was admitted among the Jews, but it was materially different from modern slavery. As first—They were to be purchased from the heathens round about them, and neither stolen or taken by force. 2d—They were liable to be emancipated as soon as they complied with the ordinances of circumcision, and if they did not comply with that rite, their children must of necessity have been free at the ordinary time of native Jews, because all the Jews were bound to circumcise all that were born in their houses, or bought with their money, in consequence of which they became Jews, who could not be retained in bondage more than six years. 3d—If such as were purchased in an adult age, refused to comply with the ordinance of circumcision, they were only subject to servitude until the year of jubilee; but in that case their bondage did not entail the same to their posterity. That all servants among the Jews in every age were initiated into the Jewish church by circumcision, is as clearly revealed in the word of God, as any one truth it contains. Gen. xvii. 10. "This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee. Every man child among you shall be circumcised—verse 12; and he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house or bought

with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed—verse 13. He that is born in the house or he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

Secondly.—Circumcision entitled every subject of that ordinance to eat the passover, which supposes his initiation into the Jewish church and nation to be indisputable—Exodus, xii. 23. "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, this is the ordinance of the passover; there shall no stranger eat thereof, but every man servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof; a foreigner and an hired servant shall not eat thereof."

Thirdly.—No Hebrew could be in servitude longer than six years. Exodus, xxi. 2,—"If thou buy an Hebrew servant six years shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." Compared with Deut. xv, 12. If then circumcision made every servant bought with money a Jew, and no Jew would be retained in servitude more than six years, the unavoidable consequence must be, that there could be no perpetual involuntary servants among the Jews. The whole argument runs thus: All Jews were bound to circumcise all born in their houses, or bought with money; circumcision made every one who was a subject of circumcision a Jew. No Jew could be a servant longer than six years, except he was so of choice. Therefore there could be no perpetual servants under the Jewish dispensation.

The expression, "ye shall take them for an inheritance for your children after you," means that the same persons thus purchased of the heathen around them were not to be made free at the death of the purchaser, but were bound to serve their children. The last words, they shall be your bondmen forever, can only mean until the year of jubilee, which may be evinced from two reasons, although the phrase forever, and the word ever (in scripture) most certainly signifies an endless duration; yet it is sometimes used in a limited sense, as to the time of the Old Testament. Leviticus xviii. 15. To the year of jubilee, Deut. xv. 17, to man's life time, 1st Samuel i. 22.

It signifies a long indefinite time, Joshua ii. 7. The sense of the word ever, or forever, may be known by the particular duration of that thing to which the expression is applied. Thus it signifies an endless duration, when it is used to express the duration of the saint's happiness in heaven, because the saints will eternally exist, and to express the duration of hell's torments, because the wicked will eternally exist. When it means only a temporary duration, it has a relation to some period which will necessarily have an end, and signifies that entire period. Thus it is sometimes used to express the duration of some blessing or privilege, properly restricted to the old testament dispensation, when it signifies the whole time of that dispensation, so a man's state of servitude was said to be forever, when it meant that it should continue until the year of jubilee, though it must of necessity have terminated with the period, in which case the temporary duration of that period determines the sense of the expression forever, shews it to be temporary and not eternal.

That the expression (bond servant forever) means only a temporary duration will further appear from God's aim in appointing the ordinance of jubilee, which was to give liberty to all that were in bondage. Lev. xxv. 10. "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof, it shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his own family." Josephus, who had a better right to know the latitude to which the jubilee extended than any other ancient writer of which we have any knowledge, expressly says that it extended to slaves.—(See his Antiquities, page 73, quarto.)

Secondly. That the expression forever, was limited by the jubilee, is evident from the application of the phrase in other places. Lev. xxv. 39—40. "And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve thee as a bond servant, but as an hired servant, as a sojourner; he shall be with thee and serve thee until the year of jubilee." But the person that is here said to serve until the year of jubilee is called a servant forever. Exodus xxi. 2. 7—Deut. xv. 12, 17. Objection. If no servant

could be compelled to serve more than six years after being circumcised, what classes of servants were bound to serve until the year of jubilee? Ans. Such Jewish servants as refused freedom at the expiration of six years' service, and such of the heathen as refused to be received into the Jewish church by circumcision, and such as were convicted of crimes, which last is attested by Josephus.

THE GOLDEN RULE.

Among the Jews, agreeable to the nature and circumstances of servitude, as it has now been defined, the golden rule laid down by Jesus Christ, might have been applied in its fullest latitude by both masters and servants. "In all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This will appear from the peculiar circumstances of their condition. 1st. Servants bought of the heathen were most apt to be captives taken in war, or persons convicted of crimes; but none were kidnapped, because the man-thief and the receiver were both condemned to suffer death by the law of Moses. 2d. The heathen nations around the Jews were all civilized, and existed under organized governments, and could have no temptations to kidnap and sell their own people, except such as were legally convicted of crimes, or captives taken in war. 3d. Though servants from among the heathen were liable to be some captives, some convicts, others debtors, their condition was made better by becoming servants to the Jews, because they were admitted to all the privileges of the Jewish church as soon as they were prepared for it. 4th. If they did not comply with the rite of circumcision, yet their children were made free by circumcision, while they, viz. their parents, were to be made free at the jubilee. But that which rendered their servitude quite tolerable, was the law of God which regulated the government of servants. Ex. xxi. 26. "If a man smite the eye of his servant or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go for his eye's sake. And if he smite out his man servant's tooth or his maid servant's tooth he shall let him go for his tooth's sake." The rule which obliged a master to liberate his servant for sake of an eye or a tooth, would do

equally the same in any case of maiming or dismembering of the body, verse 20. "And if a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand he shall surely be punished." That this punishment was death is manifest from Lev. v. 22. "Notwithstanding if he continue a day or two he shall not be punished, for he is his money." Wilful murder was only punishable by death according to the divine law. Therefore if the servant corrected with the rod was to continue a day or two, it would shew that his master in correcting him had no design to kill him, more especially as the servant was his money, he could have no motive to take his life.

2dly. To prevent severe treatment, and secure a comfortable living to bond servants, the law of God absolutely prohibited all persons from taking up a servant merely for running away from his master. Deut. xxiii. 15. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant who is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose —in one of thy gates where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him."

3dly. All bond servants, hirelings and sojourners amongst the Jews, had all the profits arising from their lands every seventh year which would be very considerable, Lev. xxv. 1, 7, which taken in connection with all other circumstances of alleviation prevented their servitude from meriting the name of slavery.

From the view now taken of servitude amongst the Jews, it is evident that although they had bondmen and bond maids, there were no slaves allowed among them. And it may be added that the small degree of bondage which was authorized, was in virtue of a positive revelation of God's will, and was peculiar to the Jewish economy, and not morally binding on all nations; should any inquire why it was suited to the Old Testament, and not to the New, it may be answered there were necessary duties, to be performed by the members of that church, which could not be done without subjecting them to ceremonial uncleanness, and many laborious exercises about the altar and the temple services, which would have occupied too much of the time and attention of the true worshipers

of Jehovah, without marring and interrupting their worship, which rendered servants from among the heathen necessary.

THE GIBEONITES.

This was completely exemplified in the case of the Gibeonites, who on account of the oath which the princes of the congregation had made to them, to preserve their lives, were spared, but on account of their gross deception and falsehood to obtain that oath, were condemned to a state of servitude—Joshua ix. 22. And Joshua called for them, and he spake unto them saying, wherefore have ye beguiled us, saying we are very far from you, when you dwelt among us. Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall none of you be freed from being bondmen, and hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God, verse 27. "And Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the altar of the Lord, even unto this day in the place which the Lord should choose."

The Gibeonites were condemned to be hewers of wood and drawers of water to the congregation and to the altar of the Lord; that is to the nation in their public assemblies; and to serve at the altar and the temple in preparing wood and water, and in such services as were subservient to the public ordinances of the Lord, about which his people were to be engaged; all which supposed them to be the public property of the nation, but not the private property of any individuals, and were only liable to be called out to the service of public assemblies, and to the service of the sanctuary when their service was required, which must have been done by levying a tribute of as many persons as might be useful at such times. The same persons might be allowed to retire to their own homes, and others called forth to succeed them in their turn, while we have a good reason to believe they were allowed a due compensation for their labors.

That the Gibeonites were public servants to the nation, and not private slaves to individuals, is evident from the form of expression used by Joshua in passing the sentence upon them, and also from their actual condition in

after times, particularly in the days of Saul. Saul thought to slay them in his zeal for the children of Israel. 2 Sam. xxi. 2–5. "He consumed them and devised against them, that he might destroy them from remaining in any of the coasts of Israel." From which it is manifest that they could not be the private property of individuals dispersed throughout the nation. Had they been private property, Saul could not have shewn his zeal for the children of Israel by destroying them. It is further evident from their serving in the armies of Israel, which is an employment ill adapted to the condition of slaves; also from their return with the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, which could hardly have been expected had they been slaves.

From the history of servitude now given, and from the nature and different forms of it as recorded in scriptures, it appears that there never was such a thing as slavery amongst the Jews before the Babylonish captivity, and it would be a difficult task to prove that it ever had a being in its present form in any nation, from the deluge to the times of the Greeks and Romans, who both were in the habit of enslaving their captives taken in war. It is certain that the king of Assyria did not make slaves of the ten tribes of Israel; but placed them in different parts of his empire, to live by their industry, allowed to be incorporated with his own subjects. It is also evident from the scriptures that the king of Babylon did not make slaves of the Jews, but gave them the privilege of building houses, and planting vineyards, and living by their own industry, and made a selection of the most learned and active to take part in the government of the empire.

Having now given a history of servitude from the scriptures, down to the time of the Jews' captivity in Babylon, in order to come at the main subject intended by this treatise, we shall not detain the reader with a further detail of the history of slavery, but refer him to Clarkson's Essays on Slavery, which contain a brief account of slavery among the Greeks and Romans, with a correct history of African slavery.

CHAPTER III.

SLAVEHOLDING A HEINOUS SIN.

III. We are now to prove that slavery, according to the common acceptation of the term, is a heinous sin, condemned by the word of God, and repugnant to the law of nature.

THE MORAL LAW.

The first argument may be taken from the nature of the moral law, and its universal obligation upon mankind.

In our introduction it has been shewn that the moral law is a transcript of the divine character. That it is called the law of nature, because it is discoverable in the book of nature, which exhibits to the view of mankind the various relations in which they stand to God and to one another, and as a law binds them to act agreeable to these relations, and we may now add, that the word of God is only the same law more perfectly revealed, together with a display of the economy of redemption. The moral law as a written revelation, and the law of nature as it is revealed in the book of nature, being the same as to moral obligation, it is impossible that the one can contradict or oppose the other.

To apply these principles to the business of slave-holding, it may be safely admitted, that if the practice has nothing to justify it but the civil law, while it stands opposed to the moral law, it must be criminal. Slaveholding cannot be defended in virtue of an inherent power possessed by man, antecedent to the existence of civil government, because in that state of society mankind are all equally entitled to enjoy freedom, and are all in duty bound to defend their own personal rights, and the natural rights of others, as far as is competent to them in that capacity : therefore, mankind in that unorganized condition which necessarily precedes all organized states, can have no right to enslave one another, but on the contrary are bound to protect each other against any attempts which might be made to deprive them of either life, liberty, or

property, and are bound by the moral law to adopt the best method which may give strength and energy to their lawful efforts to secure their natural rights; but the wisest and best method which has yet been found to secure the natural rights of man, is for all the members of a community to concentrate by delegations their legal right of defending their private privileges into the hands of representatives, that by their agency they may better perform those duties to themselves and others which they were bound in a private capacity to have done, as far as was competent to them.

If the members of a community can and do transfer from themselves to representatives their right to freedom, that is, their natural rights to serve God according to the relations in which they stand to him, and their right to perform all relative duties to one another, slavery may be justified, if not, it must be condemned. But none are disposed to plead for a transfer of their personal freedom; therefore it is retained still in the hands of the people. The point is perfectly obvious, for if the members of a community have no right in an unorganized state to deprive one another of life, liberty or property, they cannot transfer a right to others which they never possessed themselves. If, then, no such right was or ever could be transferred from the people to their representatives, the representatives themselves can have no moral right to deprive any of the community of life, liberty, or property, except they forfeit their right by crimes, for civil rulers cannot exercise a power which they never either had or could have. But it is self-evident, that if a people or nation can have no right to enslave one another within the limits of their own jurisdiction or territories, they can have still less without their own boundaries, or in other parts of the world, because neither political divisions of lands, nor natural divisions by rivers, chains of mountains or seas, can make void the moral law. Therefore, wherever a people delegate a power to representatives to enslave any of the human race, it cannot be a moral power, but it is mere physical power, which is the power of force, and when physical force, stript of moral obligation, is exercised to deprive mankind of their natural rights to freedom, it is only

another name for the most cruel tyranny; so that slaveholding is contrary to the law of nature, is downright tyranny, and an usurpation of power over the rights of man.

MORAL LAW CONTRADICTORY.

Secondly—Every practice must be sinful which tends to set the moral law at war with itself; but slaveholding is of that nature. Therefore,

If slaveholding is just, it must be the master's duty to retain the slave in his service, and to prevent him from deserting it. But it is the slave's duty to desert his service if he can have a fair opportunity to escape; yea, most of slaveholders will acknowledge that were they in the slave's place, they would try to escape from their servitude; which represents the moral law to be at war with itself; first making it to be the master's duty to retain the slave in servitude, and at the same instant making it the slave's duty to desert his service; in that case moral right would be contending with moral right.

If slaveholding is lawful in the sight of God, it must be the indispensable duty of the slaves' master to pray to God that the slaves and their posterity may be kept in bondage forever. But the moral law makes it the indispensable duty of slaves to pray to God that they and their posterity may be delivered from bondage, agreeable to Paul's direction, be ye not servants of men. But when two prayers contradict one another, one of them must be wrong, because the moral law cannot contradict itself in its obligations upon men, neither does the gospel contain contradictory promises adapted to contradictory prayers.

GOD'S GREAT END.

Thirdly—Every practice must be wrong that is at variance with God's great end in making man, which was that he should glorify God and enjoy him forever; but slaveholding is of that description.

For men to be in a state of slavery is to be under the complete dominion of their masters, so as not to be at liberty to dispose of their time for the service of God or the enjoyment of him, but are liable to be prevented from reading, meditation and prayer. God commands all

men to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," and has promised that all other things shall be added. But the slave is bound first to submit to his master's authority, come what will of the command of God, or the moral end of his creation.

The slaveholder's power over the slave is an authority which he possesses over the private relative duties of the slave, without being controlled by the laws of government. It is the usurpation of that power in which the sin of slaveholding consists. The cruel administration of that power, is only an aggravation of the crime; but the grand radical point in which the most deadly criminality lies, is the usurped office or station which he occupies. Thus the grand reason why a tyrant's throat ought to be cut, is not so much because his administration is cruel, but because he has usurpt that office or station which admits of neither bounds nor restraints to his cruelty; and such is the station of a slaveholder, that without control he can prevent the slave from answering the great end of his creation, which was to glorify God and enjoy him forever.

REQUIRES SIN TO SUSTAIN IT.

Fourthly—That practice must be criminal which of necessity requires sin to support it; but slaveholding is of that nature. Therefore it is itself sinful.

The practice of slaveholding can have no permanent existence in state, kingdom, or commonwealth, without restraining the slaves from learning; for if slaves should once be universally taught to read, write, and allowed to make proficiency in other branches of literature, it would be impossible to retain them in bondage, for they would then be able to plead their own cause against their anti-christian masters, and keep their consciences in perpetual torment; so also liable by reading, and the use of maps, to understand the geography of the country where they reside, so as to know the most eligible route to take in attempting to escape. But to prevent by force any of mankind from the improvement of their intellectual faculties, is to invert the order of nature, is a contradiction of God's great end in giving mankind those faculties, by reducing

them down to the level of brute creatures, which is a crime so directly at war with the very light of nature and conscience, that it appears almost an insult to the human understanding to attempt its further demonstration.

OBSTRUCTS THE MEANS OF GRACE.

Fifthly—Every practice must be criminal that necessarily obstructs the means of grace, and tends to prevent the salvation of sinners. But slaveholding is of that nature.

To restrain the slaves from learning, has been shewn to be a necessary appendage of slavery. But to learn to read the word of God is an important means of knowing the will of God, revealed to mankind for their salvation; therefore to restrain any of the human race from the knowledge of God's written word, is in the first instance a high insult upon the God of heaven whose end in giving mankind a written revelation, was that they should read it, and thereby acquire a knowledge of his method of salvation, and escape from the wrath to come, and be made faithful subjects of his kingdom and government. Suppose some great earthly potentate was to promulgate a code of laws for the good government of his subjects, accompanied with a positive injunction upon all people under his dominion to read it and live conformable to it as rules of civil duty. If a certain class of his subjects were to exert their utmost influence to hinder as many of the community as they could have under their power from reading it, merely to answer their own wordly interest, they could not be reputed better than traitors to his government. How much more criminal then must be the conduct of those who restrain the subjects of the great potentate of heaven and earth, who is king of kings and lord of lords from reading that revelation of his will which he has given to his subjects, to teach them to glorify and enjoy him forever.

Again, to prevent any of mankind from reading the word of God, is to do that which tends to prevent their salvation, because it prevents the means leading to the end. It prevents them from the knowledge of God's written law, his gospel doctrines and promises, and from the hope of eternal life, and implies a sacrificing the sin-

ner's salvation to the slaveholder's worldly gains, or a violent attempt to shut up the way to eternal life, to prevent their entering, and depriving the slaves of all that consolation which is apt to be enjoyed in reading the word of God, together with that spiritual profit and advantage which Christians are apt to experience in hearing the gospel preached, so that slaveholders are neither entering the kingdom of heaven themselves, nor will they suffer others to enter in.

AGAINST NATURAL RIGHTS.

Sixthly—That practice must be unlawful which deprives any part of the community, of the natural rights of citizens; but slaveholding is of that description.

All men have a natural right to be citizens, and to enjoy civil protection in that nation or government where they have a permanent residence, except some legal cause should prevent it, in which case such as may be exempted, have a right of removal to some other part of the world; but in the case of slavery the slaves are deprived of both the rights of citizens, and a removal to any other part of the world, without any just reason for their prevention.

All men, both citizens and foreigners, have a right to the protection of law in that nation where, in the course of providence their lot is cast, but the slaves have not the protection of law in slave states, but are placed under the arbitrary power of their masters, and have no more protection from the laws than horses or cattle, except so far as will serve the worldly interest of slaveholders. Hence it is, that in some slave states killing a slave is not in law murder of the first degree, whereas stealing one is a capital crime. These unjust measures of necessity belong to the business of slaveholding, because no man can be admitted to the protection of the civil law, without being admitted to his oath or affirmation, but slaves cannot be admitted to make oath for or against any person before a court of justice without most dangerous consequences. As, 1st. They cannot be admitted to accuse their masters, as they might readily be suspected of prejudice and false accusation, for there is apt to subsist a deep rooted enmity in slaves against their masters. 2. The danger of being

influenced by fear, in many instances, would justly deter them from being witnesses in behalf of their masters. 3. Their gross ignorance of the nature of an oath, and of the consequences of a false testimony, prevents them from being capable of bearing witness for or against any person, so that slaves are so far from enjoying the rights of citizens, or even foreigners, that they are completely outlawed. See laws of Kentucky, volume 2, from page 113 to 128, in the appendix.

AGAINST RELATIVE DUTIES.

Seventhly—That practice must be wicked which tends to make void all those moral obligations to relative duties which God by his providence and the authority of his word has made binding. But slaveholding is of that description.

The business of slaveholding deprives the slaves of their natural rights, which cannot be touched at, or affected by, any legitimate civil authority to either grant or withhold, as the right of duty in husbands to wives, and the right of duty in wives to husbands; the right of parental authority over children, and the right of duty in children to their parents.

The question is not whether all masters do in every instance deprive their slaves of all these natural rights; but whether they have a power according to the laws and regulations of slave states, to restrain them of these natural rights and privileges. That slave masters have all this power will not be called in question by any that are acquainted with the rules of slavery. If slaves retain these rights, so as the master has no jurisdiction over them, they are not slaves. For example: If the father has an authority over his children, without the control of his master, to teach his children to read, it supposes he is not a slave in that respect, but is his own master. If the parents have authority to demand obedience from the children to their commands, in preference to the will of their masters, they are no slaves. If the children have a right and power to obey the commands of their parents, as superior to any other human authority, it supposes they are no slaves; but all these relative obligations to duty, are reversed in the case of slavery. Therefore slave-

holding is of so heaven-daring a nature as to claim the power of dissolving the moral obligations of parents to their children, and those of children to their parents.

That slaveholding destroys the moral obligations which arise from the conjugal relation, is manifest, because the business in its very nature supposes that any man has a right to purchase a slave whether married or single, and to remove him or her to any distance he may think fit; and the holder of slaves may sell them, whether married or single. If the slave is married he may sell him to a merchant, who may remove him to such a distance as he may never see his partner more, which is done in thousands of instances. Thus slaveholding puts asunder those whom God has joined together, in direct contradiction to the express command of God. Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

The business of slaveholding implies an unrestrained power to divide families which God's ordinance has joined together, and also united by the ties of natural affection and sympathy, so as never to see one another more, or to have it in their power to perform the relative duties which they, by the ties of nature and the law of God, owe one to another.

From the evils now shewn forth as essentially connected with slavery, it may be proved that slaveholding is a breach of all the ten commandments.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Eighthly—Slaveholding is an express violation of the first commandment.

The man who holds a slave as his own property, assumes the place of God, because his authority comes in prior to the obligations of his law, so that he can restrain the slaves from all those duties, which the law of God requires of him, with which the civil law in no respect interferes, such as the times of worshiping God, the duty of taking times and using means to read his word, in order that he may be fit to discharge his duty to God.

The first commandment requires us to know and acknowledge God to be the only true God, and to worship and glorify him accordingly. But slaveholding of neces-

sity prevents the slaves from the means of knowing God as the living and true God, and from the most perfect way of worshiping him. It is no solid objection to this argument, that some individuals do not altogether restrain their slaves from the means of knowledge; for certain it is, that the business of involuntary, unmerited, hereditary slavery of necessity requires the means of knowledge to be withheld from the slaves; and it is a well known fact that the slaves in the United States of America and in the West Indies, are, with a very few exceptions, held in most brutish ignorance. Therefore, slaveholding is a most open and daring violation of the first commandment. The slaveholder first usurps the place of God, and claims the first reverence.

He prevents the slave as far as in his power from knowing the true God, and from worshiping and glorifying him accordingly. His usurping the place of God, his injustice and cruelty, in preventing the slaves from knowing the will of God, by reading his word, and from receiving correct ideas of the way of salvation through Jesus Christ, are not only the highest affront to the majesty of God, but they prove the greatest stumbling block in the way of the slaves to prevent their salvation. Their gross ignorance renders them incapable of distinguishing that real Christianity which flows from God through Jesus Christ, which produces love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, temperance, meekness, and that which they experience in their tyrannical masters; and thence are liable to conclude that the Christian's God must be a tyrant, and that the whole scheme of Christianity can be nothing but a system of error and cruelty. And we have good reason to believe that this very stumbling block is the cause why so few are disposed to attend public worship, even where they are not prevented by the authority of masters.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Ninthly—That practice must be criminal which necessarily requires the breach of the second commandment. But slaveholding is of that description.

The second commandment forbids the worshiping of

God by images or idols, or any other way not appointed in his word. But the slaveholder makes himself an idol to the slave, by contravening the authority of God's law relative to the slave; so that he has no power to worship God in the practical use of his word and ordinances, nor power to command his own children or household, but through the permission of his master. If the slave worships God at all, or teaches his family, it must be by the sovereign will of his master, who is his idol.

A master who voluntarily assumes that power which contravenes the authority of God's law relative to the slave, treats God as an idol, and not the true God; for it is impossible that the true God could grant any such privilege to a creature.

The second commandment requires the receiving, observing, keeping pure and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath appointed in his word. But the slaveholder excludes the slave from the means of knowing the true God and his ordinances, and prevents the possibility of his keeping pure and entire such religious worship and ordinances, as he has appointed in his word, by monopolizing all the slave's time to himself, without allowing him either leisure or means to know the will of God, or to render that worship and reverence to him which his word requires. Therefore slaveholding is a most flagrant breach of the second commandment.

Slaveholding is a most formal example of sacrificing to an idol, or false god. The idol is Dives, the god of riches. The sacrifice is, the temporal and eternal happiness of the slaves. The ancient heathens offered human sacrifices to their gods, but it did not affect the eternal happiness of the victims; but the slaveholder sacrifices both the temporal and eternal happiness of the slaves, therefore his crime is as much worse than the practice of the heathen, as an eternal happiness is more valuable than a temporal.

The method by which slaveholders sacrifice the eternal happiness of the slaves, is keeping them in a state of brutish ignorance, so as to be incapable of attaining to salvation in the ordinary way. God may, and, in many instances, does save sinners without reading, yet the tendency of slaveholding is to prevent their salvation.

It cannot be a valid objection to this reasoning, that a preventing the slaves from every branch of literature, and therewith family instruction, is only an abuse of slavery, because it is and has been shown to be essential to its permanent existence. A thing may be said to be abused when it is perverted to an end entirely contrary to its native tendency; but for slaveholders to educate their slaves is an abuse of slavery, because it tends to bring about their emancipation, and put a final end to the practice; but to keep the slaves in complete ignorance, is the surest method to keep them in bondage.

Suppose the legislature of a slave state was to compel all the holders of slaves to have all their slaves taught to read and write, and oblige them to feed and clothe them well, it would not only prepare the slaves to emancipate themselves, but it would eventually compel the slaveholders to do it themselves. Considering the slow reluctance with which the slaves labor, together with the expenses of education, victualling, and clothing, agreeable to such a law, it would cause the expenses to be more than the profits arising from their labor, and occasion a general emancipation; for slaveholders can have no profits except that which arises from extortion, or the privations of education, victualling, and clothing.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Tenthly—That practice must be criminal which causes the breach of the third commandment. But slaveholding is of that description.

The third commandment is, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

This commandment implies a negative and a positive. The negative forbids the abuse and unnecessary use of the name of God; or withholding that honor and glory which his creatures owe to him. The positive lays an obligation upon all to use the name of God in a right, solemn, and seasonable manner; as in religious worship, religious conversation, and in making oath before a court of justice. But slaveholding causes the breach of the third commandment both negatively and positively. As, 1st.

The ignorance in which slaves are held, in order to secure their permanent subjection, is an occasion of most atrocious profanity in the lives and conversations of slaves; one ingredient of which is, that of taking the name of God in vain by profane swearing and cursing. 2. The necessity of keeping the slaves in a state of brutish ignorance, renders it impossible for them to either know the true name of God or his attributes, in order to worship him agreeable to his word, neither are they competent to make oath before any court.

The practice of slaveholding is a breach of the sacramental covenant, which is implied in baptism and the Lord's supper; in both of which persons are bound, with all the solemnity of an oath, to love their neighbors as themselves, and to do to all others whatsoever they would that they should do to them.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Eleventh—That practice must be criminal which occasions the breach of the fourth commandment, which is, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." But slaveholding is of that nature.

The slave is amenable to no law but that of his master's will. If he chooses to obey the law of God for conscience' sake, rather than his master's will, he must be exposed to most cruel persecution, so that the slave is liable to be compelled to break the Sabbath. If he should refuse, he could have no redress from the laws of the commonwealth, for a slave can have no protection from the laws of slave states; such is the nature of slaveholding, that it excludes the slaves from the protection of the civil law, and places them entirely at the disposal of their masters, who have a despotical authority over the persons and the behavior of their slaves, both of a spiritual and temporal nature. Though the civil law will not grant positive protection to a master in compelling his slaves to labor on the Sabbath, yet, as no cause can be supported before a court but by legal testimony, to which a slave is not competent, the master has an absolute power to compel the slave to labor on the Sabbath, or to violate any other precept of the moral law.

The fourth commandment binds all heads of families to command all within their gates to keep the Sabbath; but facts bear witness that slaves, almost every Sabbath, are kept to labor, the females in kitchens, and the males about the stables or other domestic labor. But when even works of necessity are all thrown over upon the slaves, it will for the most part employ them through the day; but should works of necessity admit of some relaxation to the slaves, the constant round of visiting practised among slaveholders on the Sabbath will keep the slaves employed from morning to evening in serving them. Besides all this, many slaveholders compel their slaves to labor in the field on the Sabbath; others, by withholding a scanty allowance of victualling, compel them to labor on the Sabbath for their support.

The profound ignorance in which the slaves are held, of necessity occasions the breach of the Sabbath-day, because the Sabbath cannot be kept holy to the Lord in any acceptable form, but by holiness in heart, life, and conversation; and none that are ignorant of God's word, of his doctrines, his promises, or of the economy of grace and salvation, can keep the Sabbath holy to the Lord; so that the breach of the Sabbath is a necessary consequence of slaveholding.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Twelfth—That practice must be criminal which occasions the breach of the fifth commandment, which is, "Honor thy father and thy mother." But slaveholding is of that description.

The fifth commandment requires the duty of parents to children, and the duties of children to their parents. The chief of all parental duties is that of teaching children the knowledge of God's word, the doctrines of religion, and the way of salvation through Jesus Christ: Prov. xxii. 6. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it:" Deut. vi. 4. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and

thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and thou shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates." But cruel slaveholding prevents family instruction. It necessarily prevents both parents and children from either knowing or fulfilling their reciprocal obligations to each other, by keeping them in a state of intellectual and moral darkness: and besides this, slaveholders, by cruel tyranny, prevent parents doing their duty to their children, agreeable to the fifth commandment, and children from obeying their parents. This they do by usurping the headship and rightful authority of the parents over their children, and the right of obedience in the children to the parents; and thus make their own authority to be above that of the moral law, as it relates to the duties of parents to children, and those of children to their parents; in all which it outreaches the utmost stretch of civil power, which claims no authority over the private rights and private duties of the citizens; so that a slaveholder is a tyrant, a cruel despot, in the most aggravated sense in which it can be understood. The grand point of difference between a government founded on equity, and one that is despotical, lies in one thing. The former is a power delegated to civil rulers from the people, which cannot interfere with the private rights or private relative duties of the people, which are incapable of being transferred to representatives; but the latter, without the consent of the people, usurps a power over the community to command them at his pleasure, but rarely, in the administration of his power, meddles with the private rights and private duties of the citizens. The slaveholder ranks on a level with the worst of tyrants upon the globe, as to his usurpation of power; but, in his administration of that power, he far exceeds the most cruel tyrant upon earth: so that slaveholding is so flagrant a breach of the fifth commandment, that the most superficial observer may be led to conviction who will apply his mind to the subject.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Thirteenth—That practice must be criminal which implies a breach of the sixth commandment. But slaveholding is of that description.

1st. Slavery is founded on violence, both in its origin and continuance, to which if the slave would not submit, he would be liable to suffer death—that is to be beaten and abused, to compel him to submit to the cruel yoke, which, should he still refuse to comply with, would at length issue in his death; for with slaveholders there is no medium between punishment and death, but submission. Should the slave persist in refusing submission, he could expect nothing but death. Therefore, slaveholding is founded upon and exists by murder; and murder is essential to its existence. No one will deny that a robber on the highway is a murderer in the sight of God, who obtains his booty on condition of saving life.

2d. Should the slaves attempt to emancipate themselves by force, which every candid mind will grant would be morally right, according to the laws of slave states, death would be their portion; so that murder is the foundation and support of slavery. But murder is not only theoretically interwoven with slavery; but it is practically exemplified; so that there are few settlements, where slavery is practised, in which there is not a number of instances of slaves suffering death, that, in God's account, will be reputed murder, which are caused by either cruel beating, want of clothing, hunger, or hard labor. Besides, there have been numerous examples of their suffering death for making insurrections; or for attempting that which would be accounted heroic virtue in their judges themselves, were they in the same condition, in Algiers, Tunis, or Tripoli.

3d. The crime of slaveholding may, by a very short process of reasoning, be shown to be much more aggravating than a common act of murder, as

The sin of murder, in ordinary cases, is not restricted to the mere act of depriving the person of life, but it is depriving the innocent person of the enjoyments of life, and of an opportunity of improving the mind in such branches of religious and scientific knowledge, as

would not only tend to increase his happiness, but to render him useful to society. The great end of man's creation, was that he should glorify God, promote his own happiness and that of others. His labor, his eating, drinking, and sleeping, are means only designed to subserve the other great ends. Suppose a family to be raised to manhood, in a state of brutish ignorance, and live all their days without being taught any of those useful branches of knowledge which are requisite to fit mankind to glorify God, and qualify them for usefulness in society, and to appear in some degree respectable among mankind. They would there be rendered incapable of any enjoyment but sensual gratifications. The great moral end of their existence would then be lost, their persons degraded to the level of the brute creatures, while every person who enjoys the advantages of only a moderate education, would say that if he could be convinced that his children were all to be raised in the condition of slaves, or in any condition in which the whole circle of their active life, their attainments and respectability in life, were to be nothing more than what is common to slaves, he would much rather they would all die in infancy. That such a choice would be lawful, is evident from Eccl. iv. 1 and 2. "So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun, and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter. Therefore I praised the dead which are already dead, more than the living which are yet alive." Slaveholding is exactly that kind of crime, which not only deprives the slave of civil liberty, but also prevents him from answering the moral end of his existence by the acquisition of knowledge—hinders his usefulness to society, and keeps him from ever attaining to respectability amongst mankind, while he is degraded to a state of the utmost contempt and wretchedness; therefore slaveholders who keep their brethren of mankind in a state of bondage, and in that condition of ignorance which necessarily belongs to slavery, are guilty of a greater crime than if they would kill them all in infancy. A common act of murder takes away the life, but it may not affect the eternal state of the sufferer. But the slaveholder destroys both soul and body for time

and eternity, by rendering the slave useless for time, and unfit for the kingdom of heaven; therefore it will be more tolerable for Pharaoh, king of Egypt, in the day of judgment, than for modern slaveholders. He slew the infants of Israel when born, and prevented them from the miseries of cruel bondage, but our slaveholders subject their slaves to a state of misery, ignorance, contempt and wretchedness, which is much worse than to kill them in infancy, and in their last will entail the same hereditary cruelty upon their own posterity to the end of the world, and the same wretchedness upon the slaves and their posterity to the same period.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Fourteenth—Every practice must be criminal that causes a violation of the seventh commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." But slaveholding is of that description.

Involuntary, unmerited, hereditary slavery, agreeable to the laws relative to slavery, supposes the slaves entirely in the power of their masters, to be sold and bought, to be transferred to new masters either in their own neighborhood, or at the distance of fifty, an hundred, or a thousand miles, according to the will of the seller and purchaser, which causes the slave to be separated from all his dear friends and relatives; if he is married, it is putting asunder those whom God has joined together, and is a direct transgression of the seventh commandment, because it is, 1st., A violent prevention of persons married from fulfilling the duties of marriage.

2d. It causes the persons thus separated to contract new marriages, and so to commit adultery. Matt. 5, 32. "Whosoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." The effect of slaveholding in this case is double adultery.—On the husband's side, 1. In a separation from his lawful wife. 2. In his marriage to another woman. On his wife's side it is apt to be the same, so that it issues in fourfold adultery—and this adultery is liable to be repeated every time the husband and wife are

parted, by selling and transferring to new masters. Nothing is more common than for male slaves to have from one to five or six wives, and females to have as many husbands, and all perhaps living at the same time. Whatever circumstances of alleviation may be plead in such cases, on behalf of the slaves who are in a manner impelled to it, it bears proportionably heavy upon the slaveholders, who are the primary cause of all this complicated guilt. Therefore, slaveholding involves both masters and slaves in the most aggravated degrees of adultery; and not only so, but it entails it upon all succeeding generations. It cannot effect the validity of the above reasoning, that some masters, when trafficking in their own species, make it a point not to sell a married slave, so as to be removed to any great distance, from his or her partner, this is indeed a small alleviation of the sin of adultery, necessarily attached to slaveholding; yet the heaviest load of guilt still remains while they continue in social compact with slaveholding adulterers and voluntarily occupy a station by which they have power to go to the utmost length of criminality that others do, and as a further aggravation of their sin, they must be conscious that at their death, when houses, lands, horses, cattle, sheep and souls and bodies of men will be exposed to sale, or divided amongst legatees, that their families will be liable to be scattered to the four winds; so that such masters, ever so tender of their slaves, during their own natural life, while they leave this world without emancipating them, they are guilty of the horrid crime of entailing hereditary bondage upon them and their posterity forever, with all the hideous circumstances and aggravations of adultery which necessarily belong to the practice.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

Fifteenth—Every practice must be criminal which implies a breach of the eighth commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not steal." But slaveholding is a most direct violation of the eighth commandment.

"The sins forbidden in the eighth commandment are theft, robbery, manstealing, and knowingly receiving any thing that is stolen. That slaveholding implies all these

kinds of theft, will appear by analyzing the crime of theft, to discover wherein its principal point of criminality lies. Stealing, like many other crimes, implies a composition of acts and circumstances. But its chief criminality is not confined to the mere act of taking another's property, which maybe lawfully done under peculiar circumstances. But the crime of theft consists in taking from another that which the moral law recognizes to him as his own, without his having forfeited it by either crime or debt. But the crime consists in two things. The first is taking from another what the law makes it his right to possess. The second is, the depriving the owner of the enjoyment of it. It comes to the same thing, whether a person actually takes that which is another man's right ; or wilfully holds in his possession what another has taken. The possession is not only a justification of the act of taking it from the owner, but it is that in which the chief point of criminality lies, because it is a preventing the owner from enjoying it. The moral law makes no difference between the first act of theft, and the wilful possession of an article stolen, either as to goods or persons, Exodus, xxi. 16. He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, shall surely be put to death."

If all men are naturally free who have not forfeited their right to freedom, or voluntarily transferred it to another, no one can deprive them of that freedom, or claim their involuntary service, but by the complicated crime of theft and robbery. There is a difference between the right of freedom and the power of freedom. A man may, by his crimes, forfeit both the right of freedom and the power of enjoying it, or he may sell his freedom for life as it respects his labor. But he cannot transfer to another his right to perform the private duties of religion, nor the private relative duties which he owes to men. If then no man can transfer to another his own right to private relative duties, it would be still more unreasonable to attempt to transfer the natural rights of another to a third person ; therefore it is impossible for any man or society of men to transfer the right of freedom from the Africans, and equally impossible to transfer it from their children and their children's children to all generations.

The power of freedom may be taken away by force from parents and their children forever, but the right of freedom cannot be taken away from either parents or children. Should slaveholders insist that the right of freedom can be taken away without any criminal forfeiture, it may be asked by what law can it be taken away? It cannot be taken away by the moral law, which forbids stealing, and says—In all things whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do ye also to them. It cannot be by the authority of the civil law, for the civil law has no power to interfere with men's private rights to either tolerate the enjoyment of them or take them away. The people, the constituents of civil government, never transferred or could transfer to their representatives a power over the private rights of men; and certain it is that civil rulers can never give a legal power to others which they do not possess themselves.

Therefore the right of freedom cannot be taken away, except in the case of a criminal forfeiture. And if it cannot be taken away by any lawful authority, it supposes that in the case of African slavery, the power of freedom is all that is taken away. The African slaves have a right to be free, but the power of enjoying it, is by violence withheld from them, which supposes slaveholding to be downright theft and robbery. It is theft, as it is a most flagrant instance of fraud and robbery, as it is a direct instance of violence without the shadow of justice; but it is an aggravation of the sin of robbery, far beyond any kind or degree of this species of crime which can come under our observation. As, 1st. If it is a crime deserving of corporeal punishment to steal part of a man's property, it must be a crime still greater to steal it all. 2d. The crime in the first instance must be the same in degree to take away by fraud and violence all a man's property, or to take a man from all his property, the loss is the same to the owner; but slaveholding takes a man from all his property, and absolutely prevents him from possessing more until the day of his death. Common robbery is apt to be a mere transient act, but this is perpetual while the sufferer lives. Other cases of robbery or theft only deprive a man of his outward substance, but slaveholding robs the person of a man soul and body.

As, 1st. It is robbing him of his God, so that he has no power either to read his word or to attend to the other duties of religion, but at the discretion of his master. 2d. It is robbing him of all his relations and friends. It by no means lessens the crime of manstealing, that the present holders of slaves did not in their own persons take them by violence from their own native land, but have obtained them by purchase or gift, because the crime of manstealing by no means derives its chief aggravation from the mere circumstance of removing persons from their native soil, which is but a small matter; but it consists chiefly in robbing a man of his liberty, of his wages, his friends and relatives, and a depriving him of the right of relative duties both towards God and man.

2d. No man can transfer to another a right to an article which he never legally possessed. The first man-thief had no right to deprive the Africans of liberty, wages, or the right of private relative duties, therefore could not transfer such a right to others; so that the business of retaining them in bondage is a recognition of the first act of stealing them.

Every infant that is born of an African slave, is stolen from its parents; which is as plain and direct an act of manstealing as the first. Considering then the true nature of slaveholding as it deprives a man of all his natural rights during life, and taking into view the dignity of human nature, or high rank of man in the scale of created existence, compared with the most noble of the brute creation, it may be safely concluded that the crime of slaveholding is a degree of theft as much more aggravating than horse stealing, as a man is better than a horse. A horse is of no intrinsic value in creation, but as it is made subservient to man's benefit. But a man's value in the scale of being must be estimated by his relation to God, as a subject of his law, and by his eternal existence. 1st. If we take a view of man in his relation to God, we will find he is of more value than a whole universe of brute creatures, together with the whole inanimate creation. The earth, sun, moon and stars, with all the different tribes of brute animals were all made to subserve the good of man, that is to be instruments and means to preserve him, and to afford him motives to glorify God, and to prepare for eter-

nal happiness; therefore a man is of more value than the sun, moon, earth, stars, and all the brute creation; because every thing which is made to subserve the interest of another, supposes that other being or object to be in value above that which is only made to subserve its advantage; so that to steal a man, or hold a slave, which is the same thing, is as much more criminal in the sight of God than the crime of stealing a horse, as all the horses in the world, all the brute creation, the globe of the earth, the sun, moon, and stars, are in value above the price of one horse. If the value of a man was to be estimated by his mere temporal existence, and his enjoyment of sensual gratifications, it would not far transcend the value of a horse; but when we consider that the moral end of his creation was to glorify God and enjoy him forever—that he must spend eternal ages in a state of either happiness or misery, the event of which is to rest upon his improvement of time in this world, his value must be estimated by his moral worth; that is by the value of that tribute of praise which he owes to God, and the value of his eternal happiness. Compared with his eternal misery, if the crime of slaveholding only deprived a man of mere earthly enjoyments, its degree of criminality might be calculated by comparing his privations with the damage sustained by the stealing of a horse,—but when we consider that slaveholding necessarily deprives the slave not only of his independent right of earthly privileges, but also of the indefeasible right of glorifying God, of using the means of salvation, and of improving those means in preparation for eternal life, then the comparison lies between the mere felonious act of depriving a man of his horse, and robbing God of that tribute of praise which the slave owes to him, and a slave of that happiness in heaven which he has a right to seek after, by reading, meditation and prayer.

The business of slaveholding is not only a continuance of theft and robbery during the natural life of the slaveholder, but it is an entailment of the same crime upon all his posterity after him, or charter given them to continue the practice to the end of the world, together with an exposure of himself and them to the vengeance of hell fire forever, and this complicated crime with all its aggravations and horrid consequences, is augmented in proportion

to the number of slaves held in unjust bondage. It cannot alleviate the aggravation of the crime, that God may, as a God of sovereign mercy, save whom he will of the slaves, though they should be deprived of the ordinary means of salvation, because slavery, with its necessary appendages, has a direct tendency to prevent the salvation of its subjects. The whole force of the above reasoning depends on two things. The one is, whether the great moral end of man's existence was to glorify God and enjoy him forever. The other is, whether slavery tends to prevent or supersede that great end. That the great end of man's existence was to glorify God and to enjoy him forever, will hardly be denied by any one who believes in a future existence. That slaveholding has a direct tendency to prevent the slaves from fulfilling this two-fold end of their creation, and of exposing them to the vengeance of God for their sins, will be manifest from two reasons. The first is, that a state of profound ignorance of every branch of learning is a necessary appendage of slavery, without which it cannot be continued in any nation. The second is, that the authority of the master contravenes the law of God and the gospel of Christ relative to the slave, so that he cannot make use of the means of grace in order to reach the moral end of his existence, but at the discretion of his master. If, then, the fact of holding one man in a state of bondage and profound ignorance has a tendency to prevent him from answering the great end of his existence, and thence exposing him to eternal vengeance for his sin, what idea will it give of the crime of hereditary slavery, which entails the same evils upon the posterity of the slaves to perpetual generations. Lastly. The enjoyment of God forever is of infinite value to the creature ; so that man's eternal existence, in connection with the two-fold end of his creation, gives the most perfect idea of the value of a man ; which is amplified by the infinite loss he must sustain should he fall short of attaining the great end.

THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

Sixteenth—That practice must be criminal which implies a violation of the ninth commandment, which is,

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." But slaveholding is of that description.

1st. Slaveholding implies an assertion and plain declaration, that the master has a lawful right to take the slave's labor without wages, which is a bearing witness in direct contradiction to the word of God. Jeremiah xxii. 13 : "Woe unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him nought for his work."

2d. It is bearing false witness against the slave, whose conscience testifies to him that he ought to be free, and to have wages for his labor.

3d. The ninth commandment requires the maintaining and promoting of truth between man and man. But slaveholding of necessity prevents the slaves from bearing testimony before any court in their own defence, or in the cause of any other person, to either clear the innocent or condemn the guilty.

4th. The law of God, revealed in his word and in the book of nature, declares that every one who is not a disturber of the peace of society, ought without interruption to enjoy the right of acquiring knowledge, and the right of all private relative duties. But the power of the slaveholder denies to the slave any of these privileges except they enjoy them through their magisterial indulgence. Therefore slaveholding is a bearing false witness against all these precepts of the divine law, which bind all men to the performance of all private relative duties, and against the voice of nature, which teaches that all men have a right to fulfil all relative duties which natively flow from the natural relations in which they stand to one another.

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

Seventeenth—That practice must be criminal which implies a breach of the tenth commandment. But slavery is of that description.

The tenth commandment is, "Thou shalt not covet." It requires full contentment with our own condition, with a charitable frame of spirit towards our neighbor and all that is his, and forbids all inordinate emotions and affections to anything that is his. But slaveholding implies discontentment with our own condition, and a want of that

charity which esteems another's good as well as our own, is contrary to that second great commandment—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Slaveholding is a sacrificing another's interest to our own, and is a violation of the tenth commandment of the highest aggravation. Other acts of this sin may be of a partial nature, and may respect some things only; but this is a degree of covetousness which, as a sweeping rain, takes all. Person, liberty, property and privileges, both spiritual and temporal; we use the word property for labor, because the poor man's labor is his property as much as houses, lands, and goods, are the property of a rich man. Houses, lands, and goods, are of value to a man, not because of the materials which constitute these articles, but because of the profits which he derives from their use. So the poor man's labor is of use to him, not so much on account of the labor itself, as from the profits arising from it; so that for one man to deprive another of liberty, and by force exact his labor without a due compensation, is the highest degree of covetousness, the grossest kind of theft and robbery; and a real slaveholder ought to be viewed with the same abhorrence, and treated with the same contempt as the most atrocious thief, robber, or buccanier, that ever infested sea or land, or disgraced human nature.

THE RIGHT OF ALL MEN TO THE WORLD.

Eighteenth—The criminality of slaveholding may be proved from a prior right which all the sons and daughters of Adam have to enjoy this world and the goodness of providence, which right arises from that original grant which God gave to man in his creation of this world. Genesis i. 28: "And God blessed them and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat."

This appears to be the grand charter upon which the right of all property is founded. And if this grant or

charter be admitted as reasonable and just, it will follow as a proper conclusion that every claim set up amongst mankind, which contradicts this grant, or prevents any part of mankind from enjoying it, must be sinful, because at open war with that original charter. But slaveholding is exactly of this description of crime. As,

1st. It deprives the slaves of the right of being fruitful, multiplying and replenishing the earth, in a lawful way, by separating husbands and wives, dividing and scattering their families.

2d. It cuts them off from having dominion over the fishes of the sea, the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field. So that they have no power over these creatures, nor privilege to enjoy them, but at the discretion of their ungodly masters. Slaveholding is an usurpation of that great original charter from God, of all the gifts of providence to all mankind, or a monopoly of the whole to the slaveholders themselves, and a robbing those that are subject to their despotical power of their lawful rights. The crime of robbery is the same, whether a man's property is taken from him, or the man is taken from his property. In the case of slavery men are taken from their property, viz., the gifts of God, which they have a right to possess and enjoy; these are by arbitrary power withheld from them, and enjoyed by their tyrants.

Again. In that great charter, God gave a grant of the whole face of the earth to all mankind, to be possessed and enjoyed; but slavery completely robs a great part of mankind of this right. It shuts them out from possessing or obtaining any part of the earth which God gave to all mankind, but this is not an insinuation that those parts of the earth or tracts of land, which have, by legal negotiation, become the private property of individuals, should be distributed gratis to those that have none; but it means that all men, in virtue of that original grant, have a moral right to possess property of their own by such ways as the moral law and the civil authority sanctions, and that slavery completely cuts off the slave from that privilege. But the horrid criminality of this species of robbery, is aggravated from the vast abundance of lands on the face of the earth, which yet remain uncultivated, the fertility

of which is an invitation to all mankind to extend their settlements, replenish the earth and subdue it; and what heightens the injustice and cruelty still more, is, that in our western states in particular, there are opportunities of possessing lands of the first quality at an easy rate, and thereby securing property for themselves and their offspring. But cruel slavery has so shut the doors of moral justice as to exclude a great part of the inhabitants of our land, from their due proportion of the gifts of God, and of their other equitable rights, and from their children after them for ever. Slaveholding is the complicated crime of avarice and robbery. Avarice, in monopolizing the land and other property of our neighbors, and robbery in doing it by violence, without the shadow of justice. Isaiah v. 8: "Woe to them that join house to house, and lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." Micah ii. 2: "And they covet fields and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away: so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage."

AGAINST MERCY TO THE POOR.

Nineteenth—That practice must be criminal that supersedes and necessarily excludes the duty of shewing mercy to the poor. But slaveholding is of that description.

The Scripture makes it the indispensable duty of all, according to their abilities, to help the poor. Proverbs xiv. 21: "He that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he." Verse 31: "He that honoreth his Maker hath mercy on the poor." Chap. xix. 17: "He that hath pity on the poor lendeth to the Lord." That pity to the poor implies more than an inward commisseration for their distress, accompanied with mere verbal expressions of compassion, the apostle James has shewn, chap. ii. 15: "If a brother or a sister be naked, or destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not these things which are needful for the body, what doth it profit?" Isaiah lviii. 6: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free; and to break every yoke, to deal thy bread to the hungry, and to bring the poor that are

cast into thine house, when thou seest the wicked, that thou cover him?" These scriptures, with innumerable other texts, lay all men under strong obligations to help the poor, according to their abilities; but there is no class of poor so divested of every natural enjoyment as the slaves. And that which renders their case the more worthy of compassion is, that their extreme poverty will not admit of the common pretext for withholding acts of charity to the needy, which is, that their poverty has been occasioned by their own bad economy, but, on the contrary, it is entirely occasioned by unjust laws and arbitrary power. If, then, slaveholders are justifiable in keeping their neighbors in a state of the most abject, unmerited poverty, and thus withhold help from the poorest and most innocent of all poor, by retaining them in bondage, they can be under no obligations, by the law of God, to help the less poor and less innocent. And if slaveholders are exempted by the law of God from helping the poor in their distress, all others must be equally exempted; for one moral law equally binds all men. Therefore if slaveholding is lawful, it will forbid all acts of charity to the poor.

Again. The indigence of the poor is liable to be of a twofold nature. It may consist of either a want of worldly substance, or of a mental want, or both. A state of slavery gives a complete example of both, which loudly calls for the charity of all to whom God has given the means of assistance. The want of the mind is the greatest of all wants, because it affects the eternal state of its subjects; for none that are come to the years of understanding can be saved from the wrath to come, but through a knowledge of the gospel; therefore, to help the poor and needy heathen in different parts of the world, whose greatest poverty is a want of the knowledge of Christ, claims the attention of the enlightened and wealthy citizens of our country more than the poor in worldly substance. But if it is a duty in slaveholders not only to keep the blacks in their own country in a state of involuntary bondage, and in order to subserve that purpose to keep them in the most profound heathen darkness, it cannot be a duty for the same people to be at the expense to have the gospel sent to enlighten the heathen in distant parts of the world. Yea, it appears an insult to the understand-

ings of slaveholders, for missionary societies to ask their gratuity for any such purpose. And it is most evident that this very absurdity is the reason why so many in the state of Kentucky, professing Christianity, are avowed enemies to the great work of sending the gospel to the heathen in Asia and Africa.

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICANISM.

Twentieth—That practice must be inconsistent with moral justice which is opposed to republican principles; but slaveholding is of that description. Therefore, slaveholding is the highest degree of despotism.

If despotical government is lawful over ten persons, it is equally lawful over one hundred, one thousand, a million, or ten million. But if it is taken for granted that a republican government is just, it is impossible that a despotical one can be just. Therefore slaveholding must be inconsistent with justice, and contradictory to the fundamental principles of our government, which recognize all men as having a natural right to freedom; and examples show that despotism is incompatible with the very existence of a republican government, every instance of which has ever been supported in opposition to despotical power, and none more so than the Federal Government of the United States of America. The revolution was commenced and established on equal rights and liberties, which were invaded by British authority. (See the Declaration of Independence.) That all men are by nature free and independent; so that it is impossible to vindicate the practice of slavery without condemning the political government of our nation, nor without vindicating every species and every degree of tyranny exemplified in the world, and at the same time will throw odium upon the authors of our revolutionary independence, and brand the names of a Franklin, a Washington, a Jay, an Adams, and a Hancock, together with all the most eminent instruments of the revolution, with the opprobrious names of robbers and murderers, who unjustly and cruelly wrenched from the crown of Britain its just right at the expense of many thousand lives. That this conclusion is just, will be further evident from a recapitulation of the character of a slaveholder.

1. A slaveholder is one who claims an absolute right of property in the persons of such as the laws of the commonwealth recognize to him as his slaves.

2. He has authority to compel them, as his subjects, unconditionally to obey his commands, to sell or give them to whom he will—to go, to come, to compel them to marry or forbear—to separate when married at his pleasure; to have the whole disposal of the eating, drinking, sleeping, wear and labor of the slaves, and to beat them at his will, without being hindered from the exercise of any or all these branches of power by the laws of his country. His whole power, examined by an impartial eye, and compared with that of the most despotical government on earth, will be found to be many degrees worse; so that, with all the boasted liberty of our government, it is, in relation to some millions of the inhabitants, more cruel and despotical than any on the globe, except such as admit the same kind of slavery.

HURTFUL TO MASTERS AND SLAVES.

Twenty-first—Slaveholding must be sinful, if in its effects and necessary consequences it is hurtful to both masters and slaves; but slaveholding, if duly considered, will be found to be ruinous to both.

1. That policy must be best which tends to unite the inhabitants of the land, to attach them in the closest habits of love and friendship. But slaveholding has a contrary effect; for the present policy respecting slavery is calculated to fix eternal discord between the slaves and their masters, and it cannot be otherwise, except it were possible to turn the course of human nature; because their interests are diametrically opposite. Slavery, with all its mortifying degradations, cannot divest men of the image of God, of the sensations and powers it has pleased his kind benefactor to endow him with. Deprived of his birth-right freedom, he still sees, hears, feels, tastes and smells; and above all, thinks, reasons, reflects, and draws conclusions, independent of all the tyrants on earth. And it is a well known fact, that from the commencement of American independence, slaves, by hearing the conversations of their masters upon civil liberty, are better ac-

quainted with the rights of man than they could have been before that period, the effect of which is an increase of enmity between masters and their slaves, which must lead to some tremendous irruption in the slave states, when the slaves will emancipate themselves, and vindicate their rights by taking the reins of government into their own hands, as has been exemplified in St. Domingo. That this must be the final result, may be concluded from the small increase of the free population in slave states, compared with that of the slaves. The ease, dissipation and luxury of slaveholders are great enemies to the increase of population in slave states; but that temperance which slavery necessarily causes to its subjects, occasions the increase of the slave population to double that of the free; which must eventually so far preponderate as to invert the present order of things.

2. Slavery has a most baneful effect upon the bodies of slaveholders, which is manifest at the present day. The most superficial observer may see that the bodies of the white inhabitants, when compared with the muscular strength and robust constitution of the blacks, are weak, puny and sickly; and this declension with the whites is descending still lower every generation. But what is still worse, ease, luxury, and a constant round of dissipation, which are causes of these pernicious effects upon the bodies of slaveholders, equally affect their minds, by occasioning intemperance, covetousness, idleness, effeminacy, pride, hardheartedness, and opportunity of secret fornication and adultery, and a preventing of lawful marriage. The causes of the evil effects now pointed out, are equally ruinous to every branch of useful learning; so that ladies and gentlemen, notwithstanding their exemption from labor, are more prone to indulge themselves in empty parade, with an ostentatious display of their independence and authority over their degraded vassals, than to make proficiency in book learning.*

* It is nothing uncommon for a young lady, when passing her leisure hours with insignificant ease in a parlor, whose brain is as scanty of ideas as the pith of a buckeye, to cry to some of the kitchen slaves with a voice resembling the long yelp of a half-grown pullet, "Mohelee, come pick up my scissors;" or "come reach me my boss;" which she might recover herself, with little more exertion than reaching out her hand.

3. Slaveholding has a most pernicious effect on the families of slaveholders; they are raised in idleness, vanity and pride, and in utter unfitness to acquire a livelihood by manual labor; which, when suceeded by a change of fortune from wealth to poverty, renders their condition most deplorable. The case would be quite different, if, with the privilege of holding slaves, the legislative authorities of slave states had systematized their tyrannical codes, by entailing the estates of slaveholders, to prevent their being executed for the discharge of debts; but as the case now stands, when there are so many vicissitudes of fortune, and changes from affluence to poverty, these direful effects are not only common, but may be still expected where slavery prevails.

4. Slaveholding has a tendency to introduce disorder into families, by proving a temptation to masters and their sons, living in idleness, (either by flattery or force,) to make undue encroachments on the chastity of their female slaves, the offspring of which is a mixed blood, which causes discontentment to the lawful partner of the husband's bed, and shame and vexation to his legitimate children. The frequency of these abominable practices in every slave neighborhood, shows that it is a necessary consequence of slavery.

5. It tends to destroy natural affection, and even to brutalize the feelings of human nature. In virtue of the laws of slave states, all children born of female slaves are devoted to perpetual hereditary slavery; in consequence of which, it is no uncommon thing for fathers to sell their own children, to be slaves to perpetual generations, to be subject to the whole system of misery which belongs to a state of slavery. It is true, that for a man to sell the children of another is in some respects worse than to sell his own, yet there are circumstances of peculiar horror belonging to each of them, that are not in the same sense as applicable to both. To sell the children of another person appears the most devilish, because in that case the seller has no moral right of property in the child that he violently wrenches from the parents, but in the latter case the father has a right of property in his own child at least, until it arrives unto the age of twenty-one. Therefore, in the case of a man selling his own children for slaves,

he acts the most brutish; but the man who sells the children of another, acts the most devilish.

6. The evil of slavery is made manifest by the poverty of slave states, compared with the free. Most of travelers who have been at pains to compare them, agree that the southern states are at least a century behind the eastern in point of improvement. The reason of this difference can be nothing else than that a large proportion of the inhabitants in the southern states are maintained in idleness; whereas, in the free states, the great majority of the inhabitants are employed in lawful industry.

The evil effects of slavery upon the slaves themselves are,

1. Gross ignorance of the way of salvation through Jesus Christ. Deprived of the sweetness and comfort enjoyed by reading the word of God, and living without any well-grounded hope of eternal life, they are liable to die in despair, or else in a state of brutish stupidity.

2. They are deprived of comfort with their families, which are liable to be sold, and dispersed so as perhaps never to see each other more.

3. Perpetual celibacy, or unavoidable adultery, very often necessitous theft, lying, low cunning, dirtiness, indecency, fornication. We shall conclude the illustration of this part of the subject, with a citation from a late publication on the subject of slavery, by a traveling preacher of the Methodist Church.

"Their situation generally is as follows:—The families are miserably crowded together in dirty pens, without any real family comfort.

"A slave has not power to do those duties which are incumbent on him towards his family, nor the satisfaction of being with them in sickness and distress. They are deprived of the liberty of seeking God and their soul's salvation, in many instances. In a word, slavery is insufferable in its nature. A slave is looked upon as the property of his master, who is his own legislator, as touching the slave, to usurp, abuse, drive rigorously, sell, change, give, and yea, beat without restriction, and brand as he would his horses; and even when the life itself is taken away, it is but little regarded. Perhaps there may be a small stir if one is murdered, but it is nothing but a sham

inquisition. His wife and children are all saleable property; so that the slave cannot even say his life is his own. They see their wives and children in suffering circumstances, but have no way to relieve them. They see their bleeding backs, but dare not say, Why is this abuse? They are torn from each other to satisfy debts, and to be parted among favored legatees. This is tolerated by the sons of liberty, who risked their lives to deliver themselves from political bondage; yet the worst of slavery is tolerated, with all its train of inhuman consequences. But where shall I turn mine eyes from seeing of evil, or mine ears from hearing of blood? The sorrows of mine heart are enlarged by hearing, and mine eyes affect my soul in beholding the sorrowful scenes that have lately fallen within my province.

"On the Lord's day, in the evening, as I was walking and meditating, I saw a man slave sitting alone with a book in his hand, who appeared to be in deep distress. I drew near to him, and asked the cause of his trouble. With a deep sigh he gave me the substance of the following relation:—

"'My dear wife and all her children are removed far from me toward the south, and I shall see them no more; and what has augmented my pain, is a verbal message from her to love her till I die, as she would me; and that she would never have another man. Formerly I was much engaged for the salvation of my soul; but now I think I shall be overcome so as to destroy both body and soul together.'

"A woman slave in Charlotte county, Virginia, whose husband was removed to Georgia, so regretted her loss that, had it not been for the kind providence of the Almighty, through the activity of her young mistress, she would have ended her wretched life with a halter.

"A poor slave a few months past lost his wife and children, who were sold as so many cattle to discharge a debt. He pined away to a mere skeleton, and gave up the ghost.

"I saw a slave near New River, who was lamenting the loss of his wife and seven children, who were then on their way to South Carolina, his grief appeared to me to

be intolerable, too heavy to be borne without divine assistance, which I trust he had. In addition to his grievance was a message he had received of her sorrow on the road; that it was so great that they were obliged to carry her in the wagon. Now reader, put thy soul (only by reflection) in his soul's place, and try the enormous weight.

"A few days ago an unlucky slave who returned home rather later than his time, was met by an upstart overseer, and killed upon the path, as every concurring circumstance declared.

"Even where the husband and wife dwell together, their conception and birth, too commonly, are not so private as the brutes in the forest."

BRINGS NATIONAL JUDGMENTS.

Twenty-second—The evil of slavery may be evinced from the judgments of God upon our nation. National sins are punished by national judgments. Our nation, though not in every section equally guilty of the sin of slaveholding, yet, as a body politic, it is as a nation implicated in the guilt. 1st. Because many throughout all the states are friendly to slavery, and many representatives from the free states are advocates for extending slavery to new organized states; while some of those who are inimical to slavery, do not show a degree of zeal worthy of the magnitude of the cause in opposing the measures of the Federal Government. At those times when congress are engaged in extending slavery to new states; so that our nation, in her public character, is guilty. Nations will not be punished in their national capacity in the world to come. Therefore, national sins must be punished by national judgments in this world. That our nation is visited of late years by national judgments, is manifest from the produce of the earth being destroyed by insects, by excessive drought and by severe and unseasonable frost. But the most remarkable national calamity is that of pestilence, in both town and country. That this last plague is a display of the divine displeasure, for the enormous guilt of slavery, is evident from its being almost entirely restricted to the white population, while the blacks are in a great measure exempted from the

common calamity. This marked difference in the providence of God between the white population and the blacks, who are no part of the nation, as a political body, is exactly similar to the distinction, that divine providence made between Israel and the Egyptians in the time of the ten plagues. Exodus, 7th chapter to the 12th: If we consider mankind in their private stations and relations to one another, we may say with Solomon, in that case, Eccl. ix. 1, 2, that, generally speaking, "no man knoweth either love or hatred by all that is before them, but one event happeneth to all;" but the reason why one event happens to mankind in their individual capacities, is because it is the will of God, that sentence should not be speedily executed, against an evil work, but that it should be reserved unto the general judgment, yet national sins are not reserved to the general judgment, because nations cannot then be punished in their national capacities, but have always been, both in ancient and modern times, punished in this world by national judgments. It can be no just objection to this view of the subject, that natural causes may be assigned for the marked difference of the effects produced by the pestilence upon the black and white population, such as that the constitutions of the former are better adapted to the climate than the latter, because we find by experience that in all climates on our continent, the same difference has been manifested, which shows that the first cause is of the moral kind, and that it is the national crime of slaveholding unrepented of and persisted in.

AT WAR WITH THE CHURCH.

Twenty-third—If the government of slaves and that of the church are at open war with one another, slaveholding must be wrong: but the government of slaves is at open war with the government of the church; therefore slaveholding must be wrong.

The government of the church takes cognizance of fraud and theft, such as defrauding the hireling of his wages; wages due to a person, always supposes a covenant or agreement between the hireling and the employer; the ground upon which the employer is bound to pay wages

to the hireling is not the covenant or agreement, but it is the condition upon which the employer bound himself to pay wages, that is, work done. If work done is the moral ground upon which wages are due to an hireling, wages must be equally due to the laborer if he does it by compulsion, as when he does it by consent. The crime, then, of defrauding the laborer of his stipulated wages, can be no greater than to take the labor of a slave without wages; yea, it is of less aggravation. The first is an act of theft, the last is an act of double robbery.

1st. Robbing him of his liberty and then of his labor, which is his property. If, then, the government of the church takes cognizance of fraud and theft in ordinary cases, it must of acts of robbery. And if an ecclesiastical court may excommunicate a person for feloniously taking a part of a man's estate, how much rather if he should take it all; and every slaveholder, who by force takes away the liberty of his slave, and his labor without wages, must be the worst of all robbers; as he by violence takes soul, body, liberty, property, and all those rights of duty which the slave owes to both God and man. Therefore, the just and equitable government of the church is directly opposed to the government of slaves; and a real slaveholder can have no more right in the sight of God, or in the eye of the church, to church membership, than the worst of swindlers, thieves, or robbers.

2d. When slaveholders and their slaves are both admitted members of the same church, the government of the church must be at open war with the slaveholder's government of his slaves.

If the slave accuses his master to the church for a crime, in support of which he can bring no testimony but that of slaves, how is he to support his charge, when neither he nor his witnesses can be admitted to make oath before any court. If he is admitted and his slave witnesses, all slaves may be admitted the same way. It has been before shewn that slaves neither are or can be admitted by any court to bear testimony for or against any person. an such cases the government of the church and that of the slaves are at open variance.

3d. If the master, who is in the same communion with

his slave, is offended at him, the laws and government relative to slaves, authorise the master to beat him; but the laws and government of the church forbid one brother to strike another under pain of church censure, while the rule of duty is so plainly expressed, that none need mistake it. Matthew xviii. 15: "Moreover, if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him of his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." As this rule gives him no authority to take satisfaction by beating his offending brother, but directs him to take opposite measures, it is impossible then to carry the government of the church into execution agreeable to the scripture, without combating the government of slaves.

Suppose the government of the church to prohibit slave-masters to strike or abuse their slaves that are in the same communion with themselves? It will amount to an emancipation of the slaves; for no one can be a slaveholder without possessing authority to compel the slaves to submit to his will.

Suppose the church to tolerate slave-masters to beat at discretion their slave-brethren without being amenable to the church, but not to grant the same indulgence to others who are not slaveholders, that is, to allow slaveholders to beat at discretion their slave brethren, but to excommunicate all others for the same treatment of their brethren, it would not only contradict the rule laid down in Scripture, but would be an example of the grossest partiality. Such a method is constantly practised in those congregations where slaveholding is not considered a term of communion; but it gives those societies more the aspect and features of dens of thieves, or synagogues of Satan, than societies of Christians, united in one faith, one baptism, and living as fellow heirs of the grace of life.

4th. Suppose a slave in the same fellowship of the church with his master, should desert his service, at a time when he had a rational prospect of escaping, but was unexpected-

ly brought back, placed again under the government of his master, and also that of the church. Suppose the master to libel the slave at the bar of the church, for the crime of deserting his service, how could the court condemn the slave for the crime of offending God and his brethren, when he had only attempted that which every member of the court would justify in himself had he been in the same condition with the slave. If they justify the slave they must condemn the master; for it is impossible that the master can be in duty bound to retain the slave in his service, and the slave in duty bound to desert it: it would suppose the moral law to be at war with itself. There is perhaps not a slave master living but would think it just in himself, were he a slave, to desert his master's service if he could. For a slave master, then, who is in the same fellowship of the church with his slave, to whip and abuse that slave merely for deserting his service, while in his conscience he could justify the same deed in his own person, would make him a complete image of the devil; but for an ecclesiastical court, professing to act in the name and by the authority of Jesus Christ, to pass a judicial censure upon a slave under the same circumstances, viewing it the same way as a deed that they could justify in themselves, would not only resemble the ordinary actions of the devil, but it could hardly be distinguished from a judicial act and deed of the great Pandemonian conclave.

5th. No court of Jesus Christ can restore an offending brother to the communion of the church again, but upon confession of his sin, and an engagement through divine aid to guard against a repetition of the same offence; but it is impossible to bring a slave to such a confession for deserting his master's service, without lying both to God and man. It would be contrary to the nature of man, and against his conscience even in a depraved state, except he was an idiot, and still more so if in a gracious state. A true child of God will apply to himself in all its force that apostolical precept, "Be ye not servants of men."

MAKES GOD A SLAVE.

Twenty-fourth—That practice must be criminal which tends to make a slave of God Almighty. But slaveholding is of that description.

1st. The slaveholder has a power to deprive the slave of the means of salvation, such as reading the word of God, teaching their families, meeting in congregations to hear the gospel preached, and of preventing them from the duties of secret prayer and family religion. These are God's ordinary ways of bringing sinners to the knowledge and enjoyment of salvation. If he saves sinners in any other way, it may be termed extraordinary, but not his common and ordinary way, for faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.—Romans x. 17. The language of slaveholding is, if God will save the slaves, he must do it by some other way than that which is plainly revealed in his word; therefore slaveholding tends to make a slave of God himself; which was one of the national sins of Judah, that brought upon them the judgments of God. Isaiah xliii. 24: "Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins. Thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities."

2d. The condition of a slave requires him to submit to the arbitrary will of his master; and whatsoever privileges he enjoys, whether spiritual or temporal, must flow through his sovereign permission; so that if God saves him at all in the ordinary way, it must be by the permission of the slave-master. If he speaks to the slave by his written word, it must be by the permission of the master. If he addresses him by the preaching of his word, it is by the permission of the master. If he meets the slave at the throne of grace in the ordinary hours of prayer, it must be by permission of the master, who can occupy all his time and labor so as to prevent the duty.

3d. The slaveholder gives to the slave no compensation for his labor, but holds it back by extortion, and equally deprives the God of heaven of that tribute of praise which is due to him from the slave. The business of slaveholding of necessity keeps the slaves in profound ignorance, so that if God saves them in any extraordinary way, he can have no tribute of praise, agreeable to his written word; for none are capable of making suitable returns of praise or gratitude to God for his goodness who have no knowledge of his word; so that slaveholding tends in every point to enslave God himself, as much as it does the persons of those who are actually in a state of slavery. It would be

the highest degree of blasphemy to say, that the infinite God could be actually a slave; but to say that slaveholders, by possessing an unlimited power over their slaves, and by keeping them in a state of profound ignorance, do their utmost to make him a slave, is neither blasphemy nor an untruth.

UNJUST TOWARDS GOD.

Twenty-fifth—That practice must be criminal which lays a foundation for injustice towards God, or furnishes a pretext for withholding from him the duties of praise and adoration. But slaveholding is of that nature.

If God has granted to men a moral right to rob one another of all their rights and privileges, and in particular the right of reading his word, and thereby to preclude the slaves from rendering to himself the duties of adoration and praise, they may on the same principle conclude, that they may, with equal impunity, rob him of his declarative glory by withholding all acts of adoration and praise: the conclusion is as natural and just as that the number 4 is the necessary result of the addition of 2 and 2. It is most probable that this process of argument is the chief reason why a family of pious slaveholders who occupy the station in its proper character, with its necessary appendages, is as rare to be found in a slave state, as a company of white crows on the plains of Sandusky. But the last result of this process of reasoning is most liable to be speculative atheism; because that man who is once led to believe it his duty to occupy a station in the moral world which empowers him with impunity to contravene all moral obligations relative to his fellow men, with a right to transmit the same office and power to his posterity forever, may readily conclude that either the God of the universe delights in acts of injustice and robbery among men, or else that there is no God at all. The first he cannot admit, as it would make him a devil. He will then be apt to conclude that either slaveholding must be criminal, or there is no God. But his persisting in the practice is an indication that he at least says in his heart, there is no God.

AGAINST INFANT BAPTISM.

Twenty-sixth—If infant baptism is an ordinance of God, slaveholding must be wrong.

The baptism of infants is in no respect a duty, but when parents or guardians come under vows to train up their infants in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; because no child having arrived to the years of understanding, can be bound by a baptismal covenant to apply the blessings sealed in baptism, nor the obligations of the moral law, if it has never been taught to know them. A knowledge of duty is essential to the being of a baptismal obligation to perform duty. If no person is bound to teach the child its duty when it is capable of being taught, the ordinance is void. But slaveholding prevents the possibility of slave parents from coming under baptismal vows for their children, because their children are all robbed from them as soon as born, and are liable to be sold and dispersed throughout the world; and if they were even suffered to remain with them, they have no power to instruct them farther than their masters grant them indulgence; therefore to require slave parents to come under vows for their children in baptism would be a profanation of the ordinance. For the masters of slaves to take on them baptismal vows for their slave children, would be still worse. It would imply an administration of the ordinance, without either a promise for encouragement or a precept to authorize it, and imply a dedication to the Lord of that which the person dedicating had no right to possess, but obtained it from the parents by violence; whereas God has said that he hates robbery for burnt offering.

Objection.—Abraham was commanded to circumcise all born in his house, and bought with his money.—Genesis, xvii, 13.

Answer.—It has been already shewn that Abraham's servants were not slaves.

Again; the command of God to Abraham to circumcise all born in his house or bought with his money, was a method of preventing them from ever being slaves, and their children after them forever; because their circumcision initiated them into the church, and secured to them liberty, with all the civil and religious privileges of the

Jewish people. But for a slaveholder to have his slaves baptized, admitting they were his lawful property, would be a ratification of their bondage, because the baptism of a person is not only a ratification of the new covenant promises, but a seal and ratification of all the obligations of the moral law upon that person. If then slaveholding was morally right, the baptism of slaves would rivet the chains of bondage upon them—if wrong, it would be a giving the lie both to God and man, by an ostensible ratification of bondage upon the slaves, in direct contradiction to the law of God, and prove a strong temptation to slave masters to believe a lie, that is, to believe they were doing God service by keeping their neighbors and brethren in a state of unmerited bondage. It would also imply an application of God's promises sealed in baptism, to enable them to perpetrate most atrocious wickedness, and a most daring attempt to make God a partaker with them in sin; therefore to admit slaveholders to be sponsors for their slave children in baptism, must be a piece of consummate wickedness.

AGAINST ALL LAWS, DIVINE AND HUMAN.

Twenty-seventh—That practice must be sinful which is not conformable to any law either divine or human. But slaveholding is of that nature.

That the practice of slaveholding is contrary to the moral law, has been abundantly shown, therefore all the support it can be supposed to have, must be drawn from the civil law; but no civil authority can make that to be right which is morally wrong, yet a civil precept may be morally wrong on the part of the authority commanding, which may be innocently obeyed, as when the matter of the obedience required may be done without violating any moral precept. Thus, exorbitant duties on articles of commerce may be paid, oppressive taxes may be discharged, and a slave may, in obedience to his master, labor without wages. The matter of obedience in these cases and such like being indifferent, the authority may be obeyed without sin; but when the civil authority commands the subjects to fight in an unjust war, or the slaveholder commands the slave to labor on the Sabbath,

obedience cannot be without sin, because both the command and obedience to it are forbidden by the moral law. Obedience in such cases even to preserve life, would be to obey man rather than God. But slaveholders are under no such temptations in relation to the civil law, though slavery is tolerated by the governments of slave states, and the civil law protects men in the practice, yet it obliges no man to purchase or to hold a slave, so that slaveholding has not the being or form of obedience to any law either divine or human, and has nothing to countenance it but the mere indulgence of civil authority, without the color of preceptive obligation. As slaveholding then, is contrary to the moral law, and has no preceptive authority from the civil law, it must be exceeding sinful, and such as are engaged in the practice may well be ranked with the lawless and disobedient.—1 Tim. i. 9, 10.

PRODUCES PARTIALITY IN TRIALS.

Twenty-eighth—That practice must be criminal, which cannot be supported without partiality in the administration of justice. Lev. xxiv. 21, 22. "He that killeth a beast, he shall restore it, and he that killeth a man, he shall be put to death. Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as one of your own country, for I am the Lord your God." But it is impossible to keep up the practice of slavery in any state or district, without partiality in the administration of justice.

1st. The petty crimes of freemen are tried by a court and jury, which gives the innocent a fair opportunity of being heard and honorably acquitted, and the guilty to be condemned; but the cause of the slave in ordinary cases, has to be tried and decided by the verdict of one man, and the kind and degree of punishment is left entirely to his arbitrary will. Should he even take his life, he has nothing to fear but a kind of mock trial; for although the murder of slaves is quite common in every slave state and in every district where slavery is practised, yet the strangling of a master or overseer for the murder of a slave is as rarely heard of as the funeral of a devil.

2d. The laws of every commonwealth throughout the union, preclude the trial of criminals by torture; but in the

case of slave holders trying their slaves for petty crimes, nothing is more common than to put them to the most cruel torture, merely to find out whether they are guilty or not, and also to compel them to accuse others. In the course of such trials many innocent persons suffer, and many innocent persons are accused by such as are under torture merely to alleviate their misery.

3d. Many slaves are condemned and executed for breaking the laws, while by force they are restrained from that instruction which is requisite to know the laws of men, and at the same time their punishments are greater than those of freemen. Thus slaves in many instances are punished with death for crimes, which only subject freemen to the penitentiary. This partiality is the more shocking, that the crimes of freemen are committed against laws which they have every opportunity of knowing, while the slaves are denied the right of using the means that are requisite to know the laws, and yet are subject to heavier punishments. This partial procedure in the administration of justice, is directly contrary to the word of God. Luke xii. 47: "That servant who knew his Lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." But partiality in the distribution of penalties to slaves and freemen, is necessarily attached to slavery; because slavery is itself the same kind of punishment with the penitentiary; and to condemn a slave to the penitentiary, would be no additional punishment.

Therefore, as one sin leads to another, the sin of slaveholding necessarily leads to the sin of murder. If death is a punishment greater than the crime deserves, it is murder. If it is no greater, why is not the freeman punished the same way. Therefore partiality in the administration of justice is a necessary consequence of slaveholding.

VIOLATES THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.

Twenty-ninth—That practice must be criminal which cannot be supported without persecution, and an open vio-

lation of the rights of conscience. But slaveholding is of that description.

1st. Slaveholding cannot be supported in any state or kingdom, without imperiously restraining the slaves from the means of knowledge. But all who enjoy the means of knowledge, are in duty bound, according to their stations and circumstances, to teach the ignorant by making them acquainted with God's word, which implies a knowledge of his law, his gospel, his doctrines, and the whole duty of man. But the laws of slave states by fines and penalties, prevent the free inhabitants from teaching the slaves to read the word of God, even though they found themselves most solemnly bound by the word of God and their own consciences to instruct them, therefore persecution is necessary for the support of slavery.

2d. But all mankind who have access to the Scriptures are bound to search them. John v. 39: "Search the Scriptures." This obligation is upon us all, both black and white, and the Scripture is a gift of God to all, containing a precious treasure of all things pertaining to life and godliness. 2. Timothy, iii. 16: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." But it is impossible to search the Scriptures, or to enjoy all those spiritual advantages without learning to read. Suppose, then, a slave to feel bound in his conscience to learn to read the word of God, (and there are numerous examples of this sort) the attempt would be repelled by force and power, and if persisted in would expose him to torture. If private Christians attempt to learn them to read on the Lord's day, they are violently prevented by bands of patrolers, who have authority to disperse the blacks if more than four or five are found together, except they are immediately under the eyes of masters or overseers. In some slave states the attempt would expose the teachers to fines and imprisonment.

Suppose a slave to possess gifts to fit him to preach the everlasting gospel, it is without all doubt the indispensable duty of the church to ordain him to that office. But if he should be ordained, he is prevented by tyrannical power

from going forth to preach the gospel to every creature. And that church judicature which would call him forth from his unlawful subjection to his ungodly tyrant to fulfil his office would be treated as dangerous enemies, and if persisted in, would cause them to suffer by the hands of the executioner. In most of the slave states the laws are such as to prevent any preachers of the gospel from attempting to collect the black people into congregations for the purpose of hearing the gospel preached, and the blacks would be cruelly tortured if found in that situation. From all which it may be safely concluded, that with all our boasted freedom and rights of conscience established by the federal constitution, that there is now and constantly carried on in the United States a most cruel persecution, and nothing prevents it from being as sanguinary as in the reign of bloody Mary, but faithfulness in Christian professors.

But there are circumstances of horror on the side of American persecutors, which makes their guilt infinitely more aggravated than that of the persecutors in Mary's reign, or even of the inquisitors in Spain or Portugal. Those polished persecutors were apt to have the glory of God for their motive or end, and were liable to think they were doing God service. But our persecutors have no ostensible motive but gain. Under the Popish persecutions, the people were not compelled to labor on the Lord's day; but under American persecution, the slaves are liable to be compelled to labor on the Sabbath, or suffer torture. If in some slave states there are some partial laws against masters compelling their slaves to labor on the Sabbath, they can be of little account where a master is so disposed; because the slave testimony is not admissible in any court. Little more than a year ago, two brothers in Gallatin county, in the state of Kentucky, ordered their slaves to labor on the Sabbath. Upon their refusal, they were put to the torture, scourged most unmercifully until they submitted to the will of the tyrants, and also bowed down on their knees imploring their pardon. One of them was a professor of religion; and although he complied to labor on the Sabbath, yet would not dishonor his God by bowing down to worship any fellow mortal; on account of which his

torture was increased, but he persisted in his integrity. One happy circumstance which attended this bloody tragedy was, that the brains, the tongues and the hearts of the persecutors were such that their wicked persecution could occasion no reproach to the Christian religion.

2d. The occasion of persecution by the popish party, was the same in the main with that under the American government. One chief reason of persecution with the former was the use of the Bible. The Protestants would have it, to read and improve it as a rule of faith and practice. Their persecutors would withhold it from them by subjecting them to severe penalties if Bibles were found in their houses. That which is the great cause of persecution in slave states, are attempts made by conscientious persons to teach the blacks to read the Bible, and attempts by the blacks themselves to learn to read, and have the use of the Scriptures; but the slaveholders who are supported by law, imperiously withhold them from the use of the Scriptures, by restraining them from all means of learning to read it. It comes to the same thing in the event, and the kind of persecution is the same whether the Bible is by force withheld from the people, or the people by force withheld from the Bible. But there are two other circumstances of aggravation attached to the heaven-daring guilt of slaveholding persecutors with which the others were not chargeable. The popish persecutors never restrained the Protestants from learning to read; so that although the Bible was withheld from them, they were apt to have opportunities of keeping Bibles in some private situation; or if they could not always succeed in that, they could read other books, and were liable to cultivate their minds so far as to acquire a knowledge of the gospel. But our slaveholders will not suffer the slaves to learn to read. They prevent the stream of knowledge by stopping the fountain head, as if their whole scheme was to have them cursed with ignorance in this world, and damned in that to come.

3d. The Protestants, under popish persecutors, were suffered to improve their minds in knowledge, so as to know their duty to God, and were capable of vindicating his cause by suffering martyrdom for his sake, and of

enjoying consolation under their sufferings from God's promises; but slaveholding persecutors completely prevent their slaves from knowing the will of God, and render them incapable of suffering for his sake, or of enjoying any consolations from his promises under their afflictions; and thus, as far as they can, try to make them miserable in body and mind, both for time and eternity, so that the character of a real slaveholder assimilates more nearly to that of the devil than any popish persecutor of which we have any knowledge from history.

While preparing these sheets for the press, we have authentic accounts of more than fifty martyrs suffering death in Charleston, S. C., for the cause of civil liberty, or for attempting that which their cruel persecutors and murderers would have considered heroic virtue in their own persons, if their condition had been the same with that of the slaves. So that slaveholding is a system of wickedness, and necessarily requires for its support most cruel and bloody persecution of the innocent, particularly of such as for conscience' sake would attempt to defend their civil and religious liberties, of such also, as for conscience' sake desire to read the Bible, that they may know the way of salvation, and of those who, from the same motives would attempt to enlighten the minds of these benighted heathen in their present condition; so that none of our modern scribes and pharisees need build the sepulchres of the Protestant martyrs, and say, if we had lived in the day of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the martyrs. Wherefore ye are witnesses unto yourselves that ye are the children of them who killed the martyrs; fill ye up the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell.

WILL NOT ADMIT OF PRAYER.

Thirtieth—That practice must be criminal which will not admit of an evangelical prayer to God for its support. But slaveholding is of that description.

1st. Prayer is an offering up of our desires to God for things agreeable to his will, in the name of Christ, with thankful acknowledgments of his mercies. When we pray to God, two things are necessary for its acceptance.

One is, that the thing for which we pray must be lawful. The other is, that there must be some gospel promises which has a relation to the things sought by prayer, which the person praying must plead upon.

1st. First then, the things sought by prayer must be lawful, for prayer to God implies an appeal to him with all the solemnities of an oath, that the things we ask are in their nature lawful. But there is no precept of the moral law that will make it lawful to steal the property of another, or to rob him of his possessions. But the liberty of a man is his property, and the labor of a man is his property; it is that by which he lives. The children of parents are their property, more precious than any other earthly goods. To take all of these from our neighbors, whom we are bound by the law and the prophets to love as ourselves, is the greatest outrage upon moral justice that is possible to be committed in either earth or hell. Yea, it is atheism, for the slaveholder exalts himself above all that is called God, as will appear from two reasons.

(1.) God never exacts any service from his rational creatures, without a compensation; because his creation and preservation of them is of infinitely more value than all their services.

(2.) The slaveholder, by his office and station, has a power to supersede all the precepts of God's laws in relation to the slave, both as to acts of religious worship and all relative duties which he owes to mankind as the duties of parents to children, and those of children to parents. No slave can take time or use any means to know the will of God, or to worship him, nor power to teach his family, or to require obedience from his family, nor can children obey their parents but through the sovereign will of the master, so that slaveholding is so far from being sanctioned by the law of God, that it is the highest degree of wickedness and contrariety to the law of God.

Where, then, can a man be found on the globe who can appeal to God with all the solemnity of an oath, and say, that slaveholding is a duty commanded by his law.

2d. There is no promise in the gospel to secure the blessing of God to any person in the business of keeping slaves, but there are some curses. Jeremiah, xxii. 13: "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteous-

ness, and his chambers by wrong, that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." It would even amount to blasphemy to suppose that there could be a promise in God's word that would secure his blessing to acts of theft and robbery ; therefore there is not a promise in the Bible for a slaveholder to plead upon for strength to support him in the practice of slaveholding, and it is highly probable that there never was an example of one who coolly and deliberately prayed to God for Christ's sake to assist him in forcibly restraining his neighbors from enjoying freedom, and to enable him to exact his labor without wages. That which appears to approach the nearest to it, was the case of a slaveholder in York county, state of Pennsylvania above thirty years ago, who owned some slaves, one of whom, through hard usage, was in the habit of running away, but was brought back to his owner one morning before the usual form of family devotion was past. The slave was instantly suspended in the air by his two hands with his toes just touching the ground, when, after they had beaten him with an unmerciful number of stripes, they left him in the same condition, retired within the house, performed family worship, returned when done, and gave the poor slave the remainder of his punishment.

If the fact now related tends to fill the mind with horror, how would it shock humanity to listen to a tale of one attempting to pray to God to enable him to keep his neighbors from ever enjoying liberty more ; and to assist him in withholding from him the due reward of his labor, and to bless his endeavors to keep his slaves in a state of profound ignorance.

But as the Scripture makes it the duty of all men to pray, slaveholders are equally in duty bound to pray ; and, in praying, to plead with God for grace and strength to help them to perform every branch of incumbent duty with all their might. If slaveholding is a duty, it must lay the master under an obligation to pray to God for strength and wisdom to fulfil his duty according to the true nature and tendency of the practice. It may not be amiss then to lay down a FORM OF PRAYER FOR SALVEHOLDERS, adapted to the proper nature of the business, and suited to the office and station of a slaveholder.

THE SLAVEHOLDER'S PRAYER.

Almighty God! I thank thee that I am not as other men are, or even as these sable sons and daughters of Africa, which in thy providence are under my dominion. I thank thee that I am an absolute sovereign, possessed of an incontrollable authority over my subjects; that I am accountable to none upon earth for the disposal of their persons, or the administration of my government over them. I desire to admire the condescension of my great Creator in permitting me to occupy a station in the moral world more significant of sovereign independence than his own. Thou dost never demand a tribute of humble service from any of thy subjects without a reward. But I can demand implicit obedience by the supremacy of my power, and the vengeance of my rod, without the humbling thought of diminishing my fortune, and robbing my infant offspring, by distributing rewards to my humble subjects. With an exalted sense of my magisterial dignity, my soul doth magnify the Lord, and praise the God of my exaltation. Thou dost rule by established laws, which must of necessity correspond with the relations which thou hast made to exist between thyself and thy creatures, and the natural relations which exist among thy creatures, and canst not, consistently with the honor of thy kingdom, make laws to contradict or invert the order of relative duties. But, in thy providence, I am placed in a station of absolute supremacy, in which my sovereign will is a law to my subjects. I can say to one, at any time, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh. My will supersedes the relative obligations of rendering to thee the morning and evening sacrifice, by a rigorous demand of incessant labor, from the dawning light to the evening shade. I can say to one, Be married, and he must be married; and to another, Let thy marriage be dissolved, and it must be dissolved. I can say to my virgin slaves, Be fruitful, multiply, and replenish my plantation, and my command will be obeyed. I have an absolute power over conjugal relations, parental relations, and filial relations; and all the reciprocal duties of these relations, which the moral law would require of my subjects if they were not slaves, must yield to my despotical will. But O, Almighty Sovereign, though I am a debtor to thee for the exalted rank I occupy in the scale of moral existence, I must plead my inability to govern with discretion these my subjects, without I am taught the wisdom of the serpent and the vengeance of the tiger. I confess there is a kind of original sin, derived from our first father, Adam, which is peculiarly manifest in our subjects, by discontentment, and an unwillingness to submit to the authority of their lawful sovereigns, accompanied with murmurings and pleadings that they have the same right to freedom with their masters, making use of certain cant phrases, as—the rights of man—the right of worshiping God where and when they please—the right of learning to read the Bible—and some have had the assurance to plead their right of wages. These, almighty Sovereign, are some of the bitter fruits of Adam's fall; but thanks to thy goodness, thou hast endowed us sovereign potentates with power and wisdom to prevent the pernicious effects

of these turbulent passions. We have, by the authority of our civil rulers, who are thy ministers, and by our own sovereign power, put a final stop to all schemes, designs, or attempts to teach our subjects the knowledge of reading, writing, or any branch of science, for this laudable reason, that the more they know, they are so much more noisy in pleading for natural rights; and the less they know, they are so much easier governed. We can appeal to thy omniscience, that ignorance in our subjects is essential to the permanent existence of our government. We beseech thee, for the sake of our supreme dominion, to grant us the true spirit of our station; that when any of our subjects attempt to reason with us in favor of natural rights, we may maintain the majesty of our rank, by attempting no refutation but by the logic of the rod or whip. Enable us, we beseech thee, to display our dignity by a noble liberality and readiness to entertain strangers, especially ladies and gentlemen of rank and fortune; and to sympathize with all such poor of the land as we cannot make subject to our despotical power; but all such as we either have, or may hereafter bring under our yoke, may we have spirit and energy to rule with a rod of iron. Enable us to keep our subjects from the use of the Bible, and bless all our endeavors to prevent them from learning to read it; and grant to them such a degree of stupidity and want of concern about their eternal state, as to have no inclination to read the Bible or any other book. Shut up all their intellectual faculties, so as they may know nothing but obedience to their master's commands. Lord, keep from within our borders all preachers of the Gospel, except such as are slaveholders themselves; that when they are led to preach upon the subject of slavery, they may never attempt to prove their doctrine from the Scripture, but prove the sense of the Scripture from their doctrine. Teach us the most prudent methods of exacting from our good slaves as large a portion of hard labor as they may at all be able to bear without entirely sinking under the load; and keeping us from killing our bad ones by any other method than hard labor. Grant to all our subjects that patience under their privations and sufferings which belongs to slavery; and let them see that our dominion over them must be just, seeing that, in all points in which it tends to enslave them, it tends to enslave thee; and that, as the God of heaven serves with our sovereign will, they, poor reptiles, need not hesitate to do the same. Forgive the superstition of our brethren in sovereignty, who, from conscientious scruples about the condition of slaves, have made some feeble attempts to learn them to read the Bible. Teach them to know that the future happiness of slaves need be no matter of concern with slaveholders; because they and their slaves can never dwell together in the same heaven. Forgive not the sin of those who have liberated their slaves and thereby cast odium upon us, as we cannot forgive them. Lead us not into compassion for the temporal or eternal miseries of slaves. Deliver us from the evil of sympathy for them when under the discipline of the rod or whip; or for parents, when we tear from them their in-

fants, to be disposed of for money; and from commiseration for those of our subjects who may be spectators to their near relations under the torture of the whip, or the excruciating torment of the saline solution, liberally applied to the lacerated back, and for those children who may be sometimes compelled to scourge their parents. Save us from ever being slaves to the blacks in hell, as they have been to us upon earth: and may ours be the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. AMEN.

HINDERS THE SUCCESS OF THE GOSPEL.

Lastly—From the small success of the gospel in slave states when compared with the free states, it may be discerned that there is some public, notorious, God-dishonoring conduct persisted in, which renders it inconsistent with the glory of God and the honor of Christianity to make the means of grace effectual among them. This may be evinced from two reasons. One is, that there is no promise of success with the administration of the gospel where the whole counsel of God is not declared. But preachers of the gospel in slave states do not declare from the word of God his displeasure at the practice of slaveholding, but are apt to encourage it by their own example. 2dly. We cannot expect that God will bless the means of grace to any people, who, for the sake of indulging themselves in the worst kind of extortion, will withhold the same means from all under their power, and thus deprive them of their spiritual rights as well as temporal. Neither have we any reason to think that God will accept the persons and religious services of those who are already professors of religion, while they are engaged in the same hell-deserving practice. Prov. xv. 8: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord." How applicable to such a people are the Lord's words addressed to the apostleizing Jews. Isaiah i., 10—20: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom, give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts, and I delight not in the blood of lambs or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations. Incense is an abomination

unto me. The new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with. It is iniquity. Even the solemn meeting, your new moons, and your appointed feasts, my soul hateth. These are an abomination unto me. I am weary to bear them; and when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you. Yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear. Your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes. Cease to do evil, learn to do well. Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed. Judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow. Though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

CHAPTER IV.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF SLAVERY.

Some time previous to my entering upon the present subject, a fragment of a pamphlet came into my hands, which had been designed for a defence of slavery, the title-page of which was gone, and a considerable part of the work itself. I labored by inquiry in different directions to get one entire, but found it impossible; which led me to conclude that either by excessive reading it had become in a manner extinct, or else, through want of reading and neglect, it had become a prey to the moths, the moles, and the bats. In the part which fell into my hands, I found nothing worthy of notice, except three things, in pages sixteen and seventeen.

ARGUMENT FIRST.—Our author asserts that the business of emancipation belongs to the legislative authority, but not to the church of God as such.

ANSWER FIRST.—If the slaves were public property, or belonged to the commonwealth as such, the govern-

ment might dispose of them at pleasure. Neither could the church or any other particular society take cognizance of their case more than that of enlisted soldiers, who are public property. But the slaves are not public property; they are recognized by the government, and by the laws of every slave state, as private property, as much as houses, lands, or cattle, that are lawfully purchased. Admitting that slaveholding was just, the legislature could have no more right to emancipate the slaves than they have a right to deprive any of the citizens of their houses, lands, or cattle. Therefore the business, if morally right, is a matter with which the legislature cannot interfere. If it is morally wrong, it is the business of the legislature to rectify that wrong, by establishing rules of justice throughout the community, to suppress the practice. It must also be the business of every member of the community, because the people themselves are the government, and the members of the legislature are only their agents. Therefore, as the people are the proper constituents of government, it is their place to take an active part, both by counsel, advice, example, and in electing representatives, to try to emancipate the slaves.

ANSWER SECOND.—If the practice is wrong, the holders of slaves cannot retain them by force one day, without contracting guilt, so that if the legislature is in duty bound to suppress slavery, it must be because that slaveholders neglect their duty, and that neglect calls forth the exertion of the legislature, therefore the emancipation of slaves is first the business of the private possessors of them.

That the churches of God are eminently concerned in the business of emancipation is manifest.

1st, Because Christians, through the light of the gospel and the influence of the Divine Spirit, are liable to have more correct ideas of the extent and spirituality of the moral law, and its obligations upon all ranks of society, than others; therefore their superior knowledge and experience lay them under peculiar obligations to use their best endeavors to have the slave emancipated. God's word testifies that to whom much is given, of them much is required.

2d. The church of God is forbidden to give that which

is holy to the dogs, or to cast his pearls before swine. That is, to dispense the holy seals of his covenant, and grant other peculiar privileges of his house to such as are ignorant or scandalous. If slaveholding is sinful, it is so exceeding sinful that if any class of sinners may be compared to dogs or swine, slaveholders may.

3d. The church of Christ are bound, as faithful witnesses for Christ, and agents called to officiate in his name when they admit members to church fellowship, to make a difference between the clean and the unclean, and are forbidden to make the table of the Lord a table of devils, so that they are bound to take cognizance of every criminal act or practice as far as it may be known or persisted in. Neither ought the decisions of the legislature or of any civil court to have any influence over an ecclesiastical court respecting the terms of communion. If the church must be governed by the legislature in the admission or non-admission of slaveholders to fellowship, she may be governed by civil determinations in all matters of a moral kind, which would throw the whole power of ecclesiastical government into the hands of the civil authority, and make church officers to be mere tools of civil power, and recognize civil government as head of the church; therefore the practice of slaveholding comes as directly under the special cognizance of church courts, as horse stealing or any other transgression of the moral law, and is as much more deserving of excommunication, as man stealing is worse than horse stealing.

It appears that a more shocking declaration can hardly be imagined than that of our author. If slaveholding is lawful, it surely belongs to the church to justify it, and to pray for its support. If it is immoral, it belongs to the church to purge herself of so criminal a practice. But the doctrine inculcated by the author, is highly worthy of a slaveholder, whose station as such makes him head over all the concerns of his slaves, and all relations and relative duties, both civil and spiritual; and the same arguments which go to justify a slave-master in officiating as head over all the spiritual and temporal concerns of the slaves, will equally justify the civil authority in assuming headship over the church.

Arg. 2. Page 18, our author grants "That the act of subjecting the Africans to perpetual servitude, was a violation of equity which ought to be observed by nations in their transactions with one another." In the same page, says he, "The principles of operation upon which the political machine is set in motion, may make things proper or improper, which would not be so should the course of the civil establishment be different." The sense of our author's words in this argument appears to be to this effect, that the Africans were unjustly subjected to slavery at first, but that the principles upon which our government is put into operation may make things proper or improper, which would not be so should the course of the civil establishment be different. When these declarations are applied to the subject of African slavery, they must mean, that as the civil establishment can make things lawful which were immoral before, so our government having sanctioned slavery by law has made it lawful, although it was in its nature immoral before. *Answer.* Slavery is so far from being any thing upon which or by which our political machine was set in motion that the reverse is manifest from the very foundation of the constitution. (See the Declaration of Independence, page 1st.) "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." So that African slavery is so far from having a place in our political machine, or even from being a necessary production of it, that it is condemned by the Constitution, and is only permitted by the administration. Although laws have been passed to protect the citizens in holding slaves, yet no one is bound to either purchase slaves, or to hold them in possession; and although the civil authority did oblige the people to hold them it would be no reason why they should obey. Such a law, rather than the law of God, that forbids man-stealing under pain of death, it is a manifest conclusion from the author's words in the above citation; that the civil legislature of a nation has a power of changing the obligations of the moral law by making that to be just which the moral law condemns, and condemning

that which it has made just, if a civil legislature has a right and power thus to invert the obligations of God's law in one case, it must have the same in all points of moral obligation. This is the doctrine of passive obedience with a witness though the civil authority may pass unjust laws that may be innocently obeyed. But the matter of obedience in such cases, is in its nature indifferent; but none will imagine that the business of holding men in a state of unmerited, involuntary, hereditary bondage is a matter of indifference, but that it comes immediately under the obligation of the moral law to either justify or condemn it.

ARG. 3. Page 23. "It is nonsense to say that those who use them as well as their bound condition of life will admit, deprive them of liberty. We cannot deprive a person of a thing of which he is not in possession. We find them in a state of privation; they may be used in this condition of servitude with full conformity to that summary of the divine law, do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

ANSWER. Our author asserts that we cannot deprive a person of a thing of which he is not in possession. This declaration is at variance with innumerable facts. For example—many a child is deprived of an estate which it never had in possession, but had a just right to possess; and many Africans are deprived of a right to freedom which they never had in possession. The question at issue is not whether the African slaves ever possessed freedom, but whether they possess a right to be free; there is a right of freedom and a power of enjoying it. The Africans in a state of slavery have the same right to freedom with all mankind, but they possess not the power; for the power is on the side of the oppressors, while they have no comforter. For a people to lose the power of freedom, is no reason why they should lose their right to it, because it would suppose physical force to be the rule of human action; this would be the unavoidable consequence. If ever the Africans had a moral right to be free, and lost that right by physical force, it will suppose that it was first morally right for them to be free. But physical force has made it to be morally

wrong. Our author then, taking it for granted that his position is just, with an air of triumph asserts, "That they may be used in their present condition of servitude, with full conformity to that summary of the divine law, 'Do to others as you would they should do to you.'" This rule is not to be applied to our passions or appetites. It goes upon principles of equity, and does not afford relief to all those demands which might exist in the breast of our neighbor.

Many of the covetous and extortioners have strained their inventive powers to wrest this text, but it will speak for itself. Our author, either from a consciousness of the impregnable force he had to encounter, or else from mere modesty, only undertakes the exposition of one part of the text, leaving out that part which is essential to the true application of the whole, the words as recorded, Matthew vii. 12, read thus: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them, for this is the law and the prophets." If he had taken in the first clause of the text, all things, it would have embraced every thing without exception, and in particular the right of freedom as well as the power of it. The sense of the words cannot be mistaken by any rational being, except such as are disposed to wrest it in accommodation to their own peculiar prejudices. It sufficiently guards against any such abuse as our author insinuates; the sense is plain and determined, "all things whatsoever,"&c. That is, let the thing be what it may, if you wish another to do it to you, it lies imperiously upon you to do the very same for them also. So that the more that we give way to ungenerous and extravagant wishes of service from others around us, the heavier and more is the load of duty, which we bring upon ourselves; therefore the words can mean no other than this, that in all things in which it would be just and lawful for us to wish another to do a favor to us we should allow ourselves to do the same unto him. As this text relates to the case of slavery, we may put the same question to ourselves. If I and my posterity were subject to a state of unmerited, involuntary, hereditary slavery, could I reasonably wish that such as withhold liberty from me and my posterity, would release us from that bondage? If this would be a lawful wish,

which none will dispute, it will necessarily follow that we should do the same to them who may be in bondage to us.

Again. If we wish the Africans to be in bondage to us, could we, upon their wishing our servitude to them, consent to be their slaves as they have been to us? If we could not, it is manifest that this text is at open war with our author's views of slavery, and it is impossible to keep any of mankind in a state of unmerited, involuntary slavery, with conformity to it as a summary of the divine law.

ARG.—1. A late writer on the subject of moral science whose name in the literary world is distinguished by the initial letters of graduation, D. D., LL. D., asserts in one page of his lectures, that slavery is contrary both to justice and humanity, and that the African trade for slaves is among the most atrocious inroads upon justice and humanity which have ever been practised in any age or nation; yet in the very next page he says, that neither justice nor humanity require that the master, who has become the innocent possessor of that property, should impoverish himself for the benefit of his slaves.

ANSWER.—It is impossible for a man to innocently possess what he knows to have been stolen. The act of removing the Africans from their native country, is not that in which the peculiar aggravation of man-stealing lies, but it consists in robbing them of their liberty, labor, time, and all their natural rights. If, then, the great sin of man-stealing lies in robbing men of all these, rather than in a violent removal of their persons from their native soil, it is impossible that another person, by paying a sum of money to purchase a right and power to continue the same robbery can be innocent, as if wickedness, by a mere transfer of the power of committing it, could by that remove of the agency become virtue.

It is certain that when a man makes a purchase of a slave, he buys him, soul and body; but it is obvious at first view that the soul and body, abstractly considered, are not the object of his purchase, but the man's time, liberty, labor, and all his natural rights are his chief objects, in order to make them serve his worldly interest, and this was the alone object the first man-thief had, when he removed him

soul and body from Africa; therefore the man who pays his money to a slave trader for a slave, pays it for a power to act and carry into operation the same thing, which was the alone motive the first man-thief had in view in stealing the man, and is that property of the whole transaction which is most criminal. It is true that the man who buys a slave pays his money for him; but it is also true that the first man-thief was at some expense to obtain him; he spent his time, and risked his life, which are as valuable as money.

2*d*. The first act of stealing the man, and the second act of holding him in bondage, when both are considered abstractly, will be found to be equally criminal; but the last, when its circumstances and consequences are taken into view, will be found to be much the worst. The first act implied double robbery; it was a violent separation of husbands from their wives, and wives from their husbands, parents from their children, and children from their parents; so that it implied double robbery, though one and the same transaction; because in all cases wherein the husband is taken from the wife, the wife is taken from the husband, even though the local situation of the one remains stationary. The same holds true respecting the parents and children. But common slaveholding implies the same double robbery. As

If an husband is purchased, and removed from his wife and children, he is then robbed from them, and his wife and children are equally robbed from him. The robbery is the same, whether the husband is by violence taken from his wife, or the wife from her husband, it is still double robbery; and if the parents are sold from the children, or the children from the parents, it is robbery in relation to both, or double robbery. Let the crime, then, of man-stealing in the first instance be considered abstract from the mere local removal of their persons, and compared with common slaveholding, it will be found that the crime of stealing men from Africa and holding them in slavery in America, are essentially the same, and of equal aggravation; their removal from their place of nativity in Africa, is no worse than their removal in America from their places of nativity, which is constantly done by

slaveholders. But it has been already demonstrated that the common slaveholder is much more criminal in other respects than the first man-thief; the first only steals and sells the first generation, but obliges no purchaser to steal their children, yet slaveholders steal every child as soon as it is born, and entail the same theft upon their own posterity to all generations, and the same bondage upon the slaves and their children to the end of time. When the two citations from the doctor's book are compared, they exhibit a perfect paradox in the science of morals, and when further illustrated in the same lecture, tend to show and establish one of three things; either that long habit or custom has a power of turning the most atrocious wickedness into virtue, or else that the most atrocious wickedness, by a transfer of the power of committing it, will turn it to virtue; or that this hideous metamorphosis is effected by the sanction of civil authority; all or any of which might have very consistently dropped from the pen of an infidel philosopher, some of whom have denied the existence of any law but the civil authority. But to come from the pen of a Christian divine, exhibits a character resembling that beast that came up out of the earth, which had two horns like a lamb, but spake as a dragon.—Rev. xiii. 11.

CHAPTER V.

THE ARGUMENT FROM SCRIPTURE.

Having now proved by a course of abstract reasoning, that slaveholding is sinful, we shall attempt to establish the same position from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

The first portion of scripture to which the reader's attention is directed, is Job xxxi. 39. In this chapter, Job pleads his cause against the harsh insinuations of his friends. Let the 39th verse be compared with verse 13, in which he shows how equitably he dealt with his servants. The two places, when compared, will show that the servants mentioned in the 13th verse, whose cause he

vindicated, were hired-servants, and that he not only abhorred the idea of slavery, but even called down the vengeance of heaven upon his estate, if he exacted labor from his servants without wages, v. 39: "If I have eaten the fruits of my land without money, or have caused the owners thereof to lose their life, let thistles grow instead of wheat, and cockle instead of barley." In chapter xxiv. Job gives the character of the wicked by their cruel oppression of the poor, which comes precisely up to the practice of modern slaveholding. Verse 7: "They cause the naked to lodge without covering in the cold, they are wet with the showers of the mountain, and embrace the rock for want of shelter. They cause him to go naked without clothing, and take away the sheaf from the hungry, who make oil within their walls, and tread their wine presses and suffer thirst." It cannot be proved that slavery was sanctioned in the days of Job, by the laws of any state or kingdom, yet it appears to have been so far patronised by some petty tyrants, as to have the principal features of modern slavery; such as that of making their domestics to go in a manner naked without clothing, so as to be exposed to the inclemency of the weather. It was also a practice with tyrannical masters to separate the children from the parents by violence: "They pluck the fatherless from the breast." To withhold wages from the laborer, is called taking the sheaf from the hungry. They also withheld a due allowance of victualing, significantly expressed by oil, even when they made it within their walls, and withheld drink from them, though forced to tread their wine presses. All this corresponds with the condition of slaves in our slave states, many of whom suffer hunger, thirst, and nakedness, amidst the abundant fruits of their own labor.

Ex. xxi. 16: "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Though this divine command was given to the people of Israel, it is moral, and proceeds upon the same principle with that prohibition in the decalogue, "Thou shalt not steal."

So Paul, with reference to this, says—"The law is not made for a righteous man, but for murderers of fathers,

and murderers of mothers, for man-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons." Man-stealing is here classed with such crimes as are most detestable in the sight of God, and most odious in the sight of men, and most deserving of death by the sword of justice. Man-stealing must therefore be a moral evil of the most aggravated nature, in every age and in every nation. A sin not only against God, but against our neighbor. If he who steals a sheep, or robs on the highway, may be considered a pest to society, of what enormous villany must he be guilty who steals or robs a man of all his property, or which is the same thing, takes a man by violence from all his property. The crime of theft does not so much lie in using stolen property, as in depriving the right owner of the use and enjoyment of it. But slaveholding deprives the man of all his property, and from the liberty of ever possessing more, and has some circumstances of aggravation and horror peculiar to itself, as that of robbing wives from their husbands, and husbands from their wives, children from their parents, and separating children from one another. But although these near relatives should not be separated from one another, yet it implies all the criminality of robbery of the highest aggravation, because all natural relations which exist amongst slaves, with all relative duties, are at the disposal of the slave master, who is absolute lord over all these relations and relative duties; in consequence of which, every child that is born of a slave, even though it is suffered to live in the same house with its parents, is robbed from them; that is, the rights of all relative duties are by violence taken away and usurped by the master. But what is the most criminal of all is, that the slave master, by his last will, gives his posterity a charter to continue the practice of man-stealing, to perpetual generations.

Lev. xix. 13: "Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor neither rob him; the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee until the morning." But slaveholding implies both fraud and robbery. It is a robbing our neighbor of his liberty, his time, and his labor. If to defraud an hireling of his wages is theft and robbery, how much rather is slaveholding, that not only robs a man of wages for

his labor, but of his liberty, his children, and all his relatives of their right of duty to them, and the right of obedience from them; and the worst of all is, a robbing them of that time which they ought to devote to the service of God; so that the slave has no time to learn to know his duty to God, nor leisure to serve him, or to prepare for eternity.

Verse 33: "And if a stranger sojourn with you in your land, ye shall not vex him; but the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Strangers and sojourners among the Jews were all the heathen nations; so that this text absolutely prohibited the Jews from enslaving the heathen who dwelt among them and enjoyed their protection, much more to enslave those heathen who were living within their own borders, and seeking no protection.

Ex. xxiii. 9: "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger, for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." That oppressing strangers means enslaving them, is evident from the reference had to their bondage in Egypt; so that this prohibits slavery among the Jews.

Levit. xxv. 35: "If thy brother be waxen poor, and fall into decay with thee, thou shalt relieve him; yea, though he be a stranger or sojourner, that he may live with thee." This is the very reverse of what is practised in slave states. Not only brethren of mankind, but brethren in Christian fellowship are enslaved; that is, robbed of time, liberty, labor, and all the rights of men; and whosoever will attempt to relieve them, must needs be fenced with iron, and the staff of a spear.

Jer. xxii. 13: "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work. This last is so directly pointed against unmerited, involuntary slavery, as to require no comment.

In the former part of this work it has been shown that slavery never was authorised among the Jews by the divine law, that although the law admitted of bond-men and bond-women, yet their bondage was so restricted as to

prevent it from being intolerable. It has also been shown that it was confined to captives taken in war, to criminals and debtors; and we may now add, in connection with what has been said on the cause of the Gibeonites, that all public national servants, which the law of God allowed of among the Jews, were to be exclusively of the seven nations of Canaan, which God, by a special revelation of his will, consigned over to destruction for their atrocious wickedness. Deut. ii. 5, 9. 1 Kings, ix. 20, 22: "All the people that were left of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, which were not of the children of Israel, that were left after them in the land, whom the children of Israel also were not able utterly to destroy, upon these did King Solomon levy a tribute of bond-men unto this day. But of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bond-men, but they were men of war, and his servants, and his princes, and his captains, and rulers of his chariots, and his horsemen." Whence it appears that these bond-men were not contrasted with the natural rights of humanity, as in our slave states, but with military service and other honorable employments in the state. These bond-men, like the Gibeonites, were public national property, the same as enlisted soldiers, but not the private property of individuals; and as their bondage could not have been supposed to be intolerable, were liable to serve to the year of jubilee, except they became proselytes to the Jewish religion. But whatever institutions God gave to the Jews which bound them as his own peculiar people, to deal justly and mercifully to one another, are now equally binding upon the whole world; and all positive precepts which allowed the Jews to serve themselves by either the persons or property of any heathen nations, are now done away by the coming of Christ.

Eph. ii. 11: "Wherefore, remember that ye, being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands, that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus, ye who some time were afar off, are now made nigh by

the blood of Christ, for he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us." Col. i. 20: "And having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven." From these passages it appears, that all the peculiarities of the Jewish dispensation are done away; so that all moral precepts which forbade the Jews to oppress, enslave, or sell one another, are equally binding upon all mankind. As the Jews were called in Scripture language brethren, whether they were gracious persons or unbelievers, so under the gospel dispensation are all mankind on account of the Gentile nations enjoying the same privileges which aforetime were restricted to the Jews, to the exclusion of the Gentiles. All the Gentiles are said to be reconciled to God, because the middle wall of partition is taken down. In strict agreement with the Scriptures above cited, the words addressed to the Jews, will condemn our modern dealers in the souls and bodies of men.

Amos viii. 5, 6: "Falsifying the balance by deceit, that ye may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes." Chap. ii. 6: "Thus saith the Lord, for three transgressions of Israel, and for four I will not turn away the punishment thereof, because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes." Eccl. iv. 1. "So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun, and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comfort; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead, more than the living who are yet alive." That these words were designed to display the miserable condition of persons in a state of abject slavery similar to what is practised in our slave states can hardly be called in question by any that will be at pains to compare his words with the condition of slaves. As

First.—These which he saw and considered were overwhelmed with grief and despair.

Secondly.—They were subject to unjust and arbitrary power, because those who had the rule over them he calls oppressors.

Thirdly.—They were in that condition as to be out of the reach of any ordinary merns of relief, for on the side of their oppressors there was power.

Fourthly.—Their condition was so wretched that he praised the state of the dead in comparison with theirs. The whole is so completely descriptive of modern slavery, that had the inspired writer designed at the time to give a true delineation of the real condition of slaves in our slave states, he could not have done it with more exactness.

We shall now state some arguments from the New Testament. Matt. vii. 12: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." Chap. xxii.37-40: "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." All men are our neighbors. To love our neighbors as ourselves is to study his interest as well as our own, and in no respect to sacrifice his welfare for the advancement of our own, but slaveholding can have no existence without sacrificing all the rights and privileges of the slave for the advantage of the master.

James v.1, 6: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for the miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth eaten, your gold and silver is cankered, and the rest of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last day. Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields which is of you kept back by fraud crieth, and the cries of them who have escaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." That the laborers here who are defrauded of their hire or just wages were slaves and not hirelings, is evident,

First.—Because slavery was then universal throughout the Roman empire, and the twelve tribes of Israel to whom the apostle addressed his epistle, were scattered abroad throughout the whole empire, which was then all the known world.

Secondly.—Keeping back the hire is spoken of as a general evil, which could not have been if the ground of complaint had been no more than that of rich men withholding stipulated wages from their laborers, because such a practice could not have been universal, while every hireling had the half of the bargain to make; and a general practice of defrauding hirelings would have prevented hiring altogether;—therefore these rich men must have been slave holders, and the laborers that reaped down their fields were slaves, whom they defrauded of their wages.

John viii. 35: "And the servanta bideth not in the house forever, but the son abideth forever." In these words Christ could not have meant to compare the local residence of a servant with that of a son, for it was a privilege granted to a son from the beginning, that he should leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife. Therefore Christ's design in the illustration of his subject was, to compare the temporary relation of a servant to his master, with that of a son to his father, which is perpetual. The servant abideth. If perpetual hereditary slavery had been allowed among the Jews, the comparison would have been perfectly unnatural, so that this text is a plain proof that perpetual slavery had no existence in the Jewish nation.

Rev. xviii. 8–13: In this chapter trafficking in slaves is pointed out as one criminal mark of the great whore of Babylon, where her articles of commerce are specified, some of which consisted of slaves and souls of men.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST.

OBJECTION.—If slaveholding is criminal, why did not Christ preach up the emancipation of slaves?

ANSWER.—Christ did testify against slavery in the very first sermon he delivered, where he publicly announced his mediatorial office. Luke iv. 18. His subject was from Isaiah, chapter 1:—"The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath annointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he has sent me to heal the broken heart-

ed, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." These expressions, broken hearted, blind, bruised, are figurative of the different kinds and degrees of misery in which mankind are involved by sin, from which they need deliverance through a mediator; but these strong figures are not taken from those kinds of miseries or punishments under which persons are lawfully held for their crimes. It is in every instance unlawful to relieve the guilty from deserved punishment, but those figures are taken from miseries in which persons are unjustly held by cruel tyranny, and certain it is that no people are subject to so hopeless and so unjust a captivity as those that are detained in a state of unmerited slavery, none kept in greater blindness, none more subject to be beaten, bruised and murdered. As Christ then, by the use and application of these figures, shews what was the great object of his mission into the world at a time when slavery was universal throughout the Roman empire, while two thirds of the population were slaves, we may conclude that one branch of his mediatorial office, was the emancipation of mankind from civil and political bondage, as well as spiritual. Had Christ made choice of a number of figures taken from those civil punishments under which criminals are justly held, it would have conveyed an idea that he came to destroy the law rather than to fulfil it. Man's punishment for sin is just in relation to God, but in many instances mankind are subject to unjust punishment in relation to one another. Christ's office as mediator was to fulfil the law, to deliver sinners from condemnation in relation to God's law, and from unjust punishment in relation to men and the power of Satan: the design of the gospel is to proclaim to mankind, sinners' deliverance from the guilt of sin, and for freedom from spiritual bondage, and to enlighten the nations of the earth, as to bring about their freedom from civil and political bondage. That the end of Christ's office was thus extensive is more copiously expressed in the next verse: "To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." This expression relates to the great jubilee, which was a general release from all debts, mortgages and ser-

vitudes. That a release from all these bonds was just, and to have detained persons under bonds longer than the year of jubilee, would have been unjust, is evident from these reasons.

First.—It was the command of God that such release should be.

Second.—All their contracts were made in accommodation to the year of jubilee.

Third.—The general release which was proclaimed in the jubilee was typical of the coming of Christ, whose office was to proclaim liberty to all that are in spiritual bondage, and to open a way for deliverance to all that are unjustly detained in temporal bondage. That this is the sense of the words, is manifest from the particular kind of freedom, which was implied in the jubilee; it was a freedom from servitude, so that no person could be detained in bondage longer than to that period. Every part of the typical service must have been founded upon moral justice, and in no respect contrary to it. A release from bondage in the year of jubilee was typical of that liberty which Christ came to proclaim, therefore it must have been just to release all servants from bondage in the year of jubilee, and to have detained them would have been unjust; that which was unjust in a moral point of view, under the Old Testament, is equally unjust under the New; for Christ came not to destroy the law. If the typical law secured the emancipation of all such as were held in bondage, the ante-type must do the same, for we cannot expect the ante-type to fall short of the type.

The proclamation of the jubilee under the Old Testament, was to the Jews, as the Gospel is to all nations under the New, the middle wall of partition being broken down by the coming of Christ; so that Christ in his public administrations established a foundation for the universal emancipation of slaves. Matth. vii. 12: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them." Christ and his apostles laid down the gospel before sinners as a ground of salvation, and also the preceptive obligations of the moral law as a rule of duty, explained it and enforced its authority, so as by necessary implication to condemn slaveholding, allowing

their hearers to make an application of the general principles of moral justice to particular cases. But the condition of the Christian church is entirely different in the present age, and in this country from that of the apostolical age. The great end of the gospel in the apostolical age was not in the first instance to deliver mankind from corporeal bondage, and to restore them to the enjoyment of civil privileges, but to deliver them from the guilt and bondage of sin, which would prepare the way for deliverance from political bondage. In that age, all nations were under the Roman yoke. To have preached a universal emancipation of slaves in the apostolical age, would have been the same as to have attempted an overthrow of the empire; but in the present age and in our nation, the preachers of the gospel are bound to address mankind in a manner adapted to their present condition as professed Christians and freemen, who are acquainted with God's law, and its obligations upon all men—to a people also, who are themselves the constituents of government, and have an active hand in making the constitution and all the laws of government. Men under the Roman government might have been either masters or slaves without criminality, while masters were bound to pay wages to their slaves, as will be afterwards shown. But it is impossible for men to hold persons in slavery under our government, without the grossest criminality, because the principles upon which we maintain our own liberty and independence, and the ground upon which we make laws to promote justice and equity between man and man, strike at the very root of slaveholding, and condemn it to the lowest hell.

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE DUTY OF A SLAVE TO HIS MASTER.

A slave while he remains with his master, owes obedience to him, and as long as he remains under his authority is bound to honor him, not because of any moral right that the master has to hold him in bondage but be-

cause of the benefits he receives from him. Although he is a despot, yet in virtue of the laws of the state, he is all the civil magistrate the slave has to protect him against dangers, and is his benefactor to feed and clothe him. For these reasons he is as much bound to obey and honor his master, as the subjects of any other tyrant are bound to obey and honor their tyrant while they enjoy his protection; and while Providence has presented no way of immediate relief, no essential difference can be found between the relation of a slave to his despotical master, and the relation of subjects to a despotical king. Agreeable to this view of the subject the Scripture required Christians to be subject to the Roman Emperor and his subordinate governors. 1 Peter, ii. 13: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." The apostle continues his exhortation to some length, when he presently recognizes the duty of servants to masters. Verse 18: "Servants be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward," but he gives not the least insinuation of the Emperor's power over them being just, neither anything to recognize the authority of a froward master as lawful. So that the same natural right which the Roman subjects had to emancipate themselves from their despotical yoke, the servants of despotical masters have to emancipate themselves from their yoke, that is, when Divine providence presents a fair opportunity.

> Slavery, virtue dreads it as her grave,
> Patience itself is meanness in a slave;
> Yet if the will and sovereignty of God,
> Bids suffer it awhile and kiss the rod,
> Wait for the dawning of a better day,
> And snap the chain the moment when you may.

1 Cor. vii. 21: "Art thou called, being a servant, care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather; he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's free man." The word here translated servant, is *doulos*, which signifies either a slave or an hired

servant. His saying, "If thou mayest be made free, use it rather," may apply to a hired servant whose worldly condition might require him to occupy the station of a servant. If it should be contended that the term in the original is applicable to a slave rather than to a hired servant, the apostle's admonition, "If thou mayest be made free use it rather," will go to condemn slaveholding. Because if it is just to retain a person in a state of slavery, that person has no power of choice, neither could it be his duty to attempt to be free, more than for a minor or an apprentice to attempt to obtain freedom from his lawful guardian or master; but if this or any other apostolical admonition relative to servants should be so construed as to require slaves to obey their masters, it can mean no other than a patient submission to an unlawful yoke, while they could have no prospect of immediate relief.

Eph. vi. 5—9: "Servants be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart with good will, doing service as unto the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free." The original word translated servants is *douloi*, which will signify either slaves or voluntary servants, as appears from the very next verse where the same word is used to express the condition of true believers who are called the *douloi*, the servants of Christ. It would sound rather harsh to call believers the slaves of Christ; that the term may signify either slaves or voluntary servants is evident from the promiscuous use of it in the Scriptures, where it is often applied to hired servants, as in Luke xv. 22; Matth. xiii. 27, 28; xviii. 23, 28. That the word here means voluntary servants, is further evident from the duties enjoined upon masters. Eph, vi. 9: "And ye masters do the same things unto them forbearing threatening, knowing that your master is in heaven. Neither is there respect of persons with him." Three things are inculcated in these words. The first is, the duty of paying wages to servants after he had directed

servants to be faithful in serving their masters, he immediately directs masters to do the same things unto them, which cannot mean the same forms of service, but it must imply just and equitable returns to them for their service, or equitable wages. A second thing inculcated in these words, is, that masters should forbear threatening, which may be done in the government of hirelings, but not in that of slavery. The third thing is, impartiality in their behavior towards them, signified by the last clause of the verse—"Neither is there respect of persons with him." But to hold men in a state of unmerited bondage, is the utmost extreme of partiality.

That all apostolical directions to servants to be obedient to their masters respected voluntary servants, and not slaves, is manifest from one special reason. That is, that in general, where obedience to masters is enjoined upon servants, obedience in children to their parents is also enjoined, which shews that the servants specified in those injunctions were voluntary servants, and not slaves, for if all children without exception are bound by command of God, to obey their parents, and all parents are in duty bound to instruct and govern their families, it is impossible that the authority of the slaveholder can be lawful, when it of necessity contravenes the authority of the slave parents to command, and the power of the slave children to obey. That the reader may perceive the force of this argument, let him read the verses which precede the words we have had under consideration. Col. iii. 22: "Servants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh, not with eye service as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ." That these directions have a strict relation to the common servants and not to slaves, is evident from his classing the duties of servants with the natural duties of husbands and wives, parents and children. That command which binds children to obey their parents in all things as a duty well-pleasing in the sight of the Lord is incompatible with slavery; therefore the words in the 22d verse cannot

have a respect to slaves, without contradicting the obligations laid upon parents and children in the preceding verses. That the apostle's injunction refers to voluntary servants and not to slaves, is further evident from his injunction upon masters in the beginning of the next chapter. Verse 1: "Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that you have a master in heaven." Masters are here commanded to give unto their servants that which is just; that is, a reward for their labor; and equal, which requires the wages to be proportionate to their labor. If these servants were even slaves, and rendered incapable by the Roman laws of being made free, this command would have bound the masters to pay them wages equal to their labor.

1 Tim. vi. 1: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed; and they that have believing masters let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." The expression, servants under the yoke, may signify hired servants, or any persons that are under any bond or obligation to serve others; yet considering that slavery in the apostle's time was universal throughout the world, the duties inculcated in the text, may relate to slaves, without contradicting anything that has been advanced against the practice of slaveholding. This will appear from two general reasons. The first is that all the subjects of the Roman empire were in a manner slaves, their lives and property so completely under the power of the emperor and other subordinate tyrants that none were free; so that the state of common slaves could have hardly been worse than that of their masters.

Secondly.—The apostle knew well the obstacles which would have prevented a general emancipation of slaves, to wit, the Roman law. He also knew that few masters would be disposed to keep slaves, pay them wages, and be responsible for their conduct, longer than the laws of the empire would admit of their freedom. Therefore, he more immediately enjoined upon Christians the duty of paying them just and equitable wages, than to liberate

them, in direct contradiction to the laws of government. The reason which is added to excite servants to be obedient to their believing masters, is properly opposed to slavery, because they are faithful; which intimates faithfulness in paying them wages, as well as beloved for their humane treatment, and partakers of the benefit, that is, of the profits arising from their labor. A servant that receives wages may be faithful and diligent in his master's service, and the benefits redounding to his master from his labor may be a motive of encouragement to greater diligence and faithfulness; but we can hardly expect that a person who receives no compensation for his labor, can view the prosperity of his master, and the profits arising from his labor as motives of encouragement.

What Paul writes to Philemon respecting Onesimus, is so far from countenancing slavery, as some would have it, that it operates against it. That Onesimus was a servant of Philemon, was evident; but whether he was a hireling, a servant for debt, or a minor, is not said. That he could not be a slave, is manifest from Paul's speaking of him as being then free from any obligation to be subject to Philemon in the character of a servant, and admonishes him to receive him, not as a servant, but as a son. If it is a moral duty to keep men in a state of slavery, a slave becoming a convert to Christianity cannot lay the master under an obligation to set him free, more than a minor or son, professing Christianity, will loose him from his obligation to serve and obey his father. Gal. iv. 1: "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant." If it is true, that a master must emancipate his slave upon his professing Christianity, while previous to that, the moral law made it his duty to keep him in perpetual bondage, it will suppose that Christ came to destroy the law, or which is the same thing, to loose men from its obligation. Phil. 18: "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account." The insinuation, if he hath wronged thee, is a plain intimation that Paul did not consider him as a slave who had departed from his master; for if Philemon had held him as his lawful slave, his departure could be no matter of hesitation whether he had wronged him by run-

ning away; therefore, when Paul said, "If he hath wronged thee," he insinuates that there might have been some part of his time that, as a servant, he had not fulfilled. "If he oweth thee aught." This is another insinuation that he could not be a slave, for slaves are not apt to owe sums of money to their masters. His saying, "Put that on mine account," is a further evidence that Onesimus was not a slave, for we have no reason to think that Paul, who was then a prisoner, could have wherewith to purchase his freedom.

CHAPTER IX.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF SLAVERY.

The arguments in favor of slavery are mostly drawn from four resources.

First.—From the Scriptural accounts we have of bondmen and bond maids, servants under the yoke, and the obedience which is so strictly and repeatedly enjoined upon them. All this no person denies, but it in no respect affects the matter in dispute. It is involuntary, unmerited, hereditary slavery which we condemn, and which no Scripture will justify, as has already been shown; and further, if slavery had never been practised in the world since the creation, all these texts which enjoin the duties of servants to their masters, could have their full and direct application to minor servants and hirelings, to such as might be subject to bondage for their crimes or for debt. Then, can any one of them be taken for a vindication of slavery?

Secondly.—Some plead for slavery from the decrees of God and his foreknowledge. But to attempt to prove any doctrine or practice on that principle, would justify the Jews in crucifying Jesus Christ. The moral law is our rule of duty, and not any thing pertaining to the secret will or foreknowledge of God.

Thirdly.—Some plead for slavery from Noah's curse pronounced upon the posterity of Ham, but it is not unfavorable to the cause of freedom that the prophetic curse

was denounced against Canaan only; and it is evident from the best authorities, that neither he nor his posterity settled in Africa. It is also a fact that African slavery only commenced between two and three centuries ago. But suppose African slavery was an accomplishment of that prophetic curse, it will no more justify the agency of men in the fulfilment of the prediction, than God's denunciation of vengeance on the Jews would justify the King of Babylon in executing that threatening.

Fourthly.—Slaveholding is justified by some on the ground of Christian experience. The argument runs thus. We hope we have been convinced of sin, and have obtained forgiveness through Jesus Christ; and amidst all our convictions, we never saw that slaveholding was a sin. Therefore we cannot think it wrong to retain them in bondage, provided we use them well. But such as use this argument in favor of slavery show that they have never been either truly convinced or converted, because all such take their own feelings and inward frames for their rule of duty, which none can do without undervaluing the word of God. Isaiah viii. 20: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

2. There are many who have been convinced of sin, and shown hopeful signs of forgiveness, gone far in religion, stood long, professed great zeal, acquired much knowledge, been in high esteem among Christians, and done much for the church of Christ, with whom the work of conversion never was genuine; so that this argument is destitute of moral right.

OBJECTION.—If a general emancipation of the slaves was to take place, intermarriages between the whites and the blacks would be an unavoidable consequence.

ANSWER.—It is granted this might be the consequence, yet it would be much better that it should be so than worse. As matters now stand, a mixture of color is rapidly increasing by means of illicit embraces, much more than could be expected by lawful marriages, if they were all free and independent, for which two reasons may be assigned. The first is, that if they were free they would be liable to improve by means of religious and moral in-

struction, as well as the white population; which would have the same tendency to prevent irregular practices. A second reason is, that if they were all free and independent, they would be no longer subject to the lawless power of despotical masters, who can, without restraint, compel their female slaves to become their prostitutes when they please. The force of this argument is evinced by facts. The city of Philadelphia in Pennsylvania, contains about 20,000 free blacks; yet the mixture of color, as to numbers, bears no proportion to that in slave states.

CHAPTER X.

OF THE REAL CONDITION OF SLAVEHOLDERS IN RELATION TO THE JUSTICE OF GOD.

It has been shown that involuntary, unmerited, hereditary slavery, has nothing to justify it in the Scripture, but is condemned by both the Old and New Testaments. That it is so directly contrary to the moral law, and the natural rights of man, as to embrace twenty-nine points of the grossest criminality. If, then, any one sin persisted in, without repentance, will expose the sinner to the Divine displeasure, and subject him to the vengeance of eternal fire, what shall we say of a practice which involves in it all the abominations condemned by the moral law; so that whatsoever is most dishonorable to God, and destructive to the souls of men, is a most prominent feature in the practice of slaveholding; therefore, except the character of God should change, the moral law be destroyed, and those Scriptures become untrue which testify that except we cut off right hand sins, and pluck out right eye sins, we cannot enter the kingdom of God. It is impossible that a person living and dying in the practice of slaveholding can enter that kingdom, but must, according to the Scripture, be consigned over to that region from which there is no redemption; and all those who are implicated in that sin, and persist in the practice, are now treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath, and just judgment of ungodly men.

It has been shown that slaveholders are most flagrant breakers of all the ten commandments; in particular, that every individual of that class, by virtue of his office and station, independent of his treatment of the slaves, usurps the place of God, and even exalts himself above him, by contravening the authority of his law in relation to his slaves. He has authority to intercept and prevent all the duties which the slave owes to God, to which God has a prior right, and to intercept all the duties which the slave-parents and their children reciprocally owe to one another; that it implies a power of separating those whom God has joined together; that it implies the highest possible degrees of theft and robbery, the sin of perjury, with a violation of all other precepts of the moral law. Therefore, the curse of God, denounced against all his incorrigible enemies, must fall upon them at that tribunal, where every one shall receive a reward according to the deeds done in the body. He shall have judgment without mercy, who sheweth no mercy. Zech. v. 2, 3: "And he said unto me, what seest thou. And I answered, I see a flying roll; the length is twenty cubits, and the breadth thereof ten cubits. Then said he unto me, this is the curse that goeth over the face of the whole earth, for every one that stealeth shall be cut off as on this side according to it; and every one that sweareth falsely shall be cut off as on that side. And I will bring it forth, saith the Lord of hosts, and it shall enter into the house of the thief, and into the house of him that sweareth falsely by mine name; and it shall remain in the midst of his house, and shall consume it, with the timber thereof, and the stones thereof." Mal. iii. 5: "And I will come near to you to judgment, and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts."

"Is there not some chosen curse,
Some hidden thunder in the stores of heaven,
Red with uncommon wrath to blast the man,
Who gains his fortune from the blood of souls."

COWPER.

CHAPTER XI.

OF THE DUTY OF CHRISTIANS RELATIVE TO SLAVERY.

First.—Christians, in a religious point of view, ought to have no church fellowship with slaveholders. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 18: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness, and what concord hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." But,

Secondly.—To consider the duty of Christians in a civil point of view. The practice of slaveholding in a slave state need not deter emancipators or others from the privilege of voting for candidates to the legislative bodies, or from using their best endeavors to have men placed in office that will be favorable to the cause of freedom, and who may be best qualified to govern the state or commonwealth; but it ought to prevent any from officiating as a magistrate, when his commission authorizes him to issue a warrant to apprehend the slave when he is guilty of no other crime than that of running away from unmerited bondage.

If it is a transgression of the moral law to keep men in unmerited bondage, while they have no protection from the civil law, to secure to them their other natural rights, it is a great duty in the slaves to make their escape as soon as Divine providence gives them an opportunity. On this ground it is impossible for any one to hinder or prevent their escape, without flying in the face of the moral law. It is impossible for the moral law to make it duty in the slave to escape, and the duty of a magistrate to prevent his escape; it would suppose the moral law to be at war with itself. It can be no just apology for a magistrate in that case that he is bound by his oath to do it, because no human obligation, whether by the civil law, oath, or promise, can make it duty for any one to trangress

the moral law. If a commission from government, and an oath of office will make it duty in any one instance to trangress the moral law, it might, on the same principle, make it a duty for the son to kill his father, though perfectly innocent; or curse, swear, or blaspheme the name of God, or to fall down and worship a golden image.

Thirdly.—The practice of slaveholding being protected by the laws of the commonwealth, will prevent any one, who has the fear of God before his eyes, from acting as a sheriff or constable in apprehending a runaway slave, and prevent all conscientious persons from obeying the command of either squire, sheriff, or constable, or any other officer of government who might demand assistance to apprehend a runaway slave, except he was guilty of some other crime.

Fourthly.—It will condemn the business of advertising, or assisting in setting up advertisements for the purpose of apprehending runaway negroes, or to take them up, either for a reward, or without it.

If the people of Israel, under the Old Testament, who had no slaves of that description we have under consideration, were prohibited from taking up a servant who had escaped from his master, how much more aggravating must the sin and cruelty be, of taking up an innocent person, who has only attempted to enjoy his natural and lawful rights, by escaping from his master, who exercised a lawless power over him, and had no right, by the law of God, to detain him one hour. That the people of Israel were prohibited by divine authority from taking up and delivering a servant to his master, is proved from Deut. xxiii. 15, 16; Prov. xxx. 10.

Fifthly.—It will condemn the practice of hiring slaves from their masters. In that case, the master delegates his power over the slave to the employer for the time specified; the employer is then the master's representative, and has the same power to compel the slave to labor, and to restrain him from his natural rights, as the master had, and is for the time agreed upon, his real master; therefore, his authority over the slave must be as really criminal as the master's, or as that of an officer of a persecuting tyrant, who executes the laws of his despotical sovereign upon the

persons of those who risk their lives and fortunes for the cause of God.

Sixthly.—According to the laws of slave states, it would be impossible for men to act as jurors, consistent with duty in a case depending between a master and his slave, if the crime was no other than that of the slave quitting his master's service. In such a trial the juror is bound to bring in a true verdict according to law and evidence. The law there meant is that relating to slaves, but no jury in such a case could determine the cause in favor of the master, without contradicting the moral law. They could not decide it in favor of the slave without incurring the guilt of perjury. The case would be entirely different, if the laws of slave states would protect the slaves in the enjoyment of all their natural rights, with the exception of their labor only. The jury might then determine the cause in favor of the master, because all the evil to which the slave would be subject, would be of a penal nature; but when we consider that the slaves have no protection while they live from either law or government, but are completely outlawed, and exposed to the most cruel insults without redress, wives and daughters subject to the will of their lascivious masters, without the privilege of a legal complaint, and their posterity, to perpetual generations, placed in the same horrible condition. It appears self-evident that they are not only in duty bound to embrace the first favorable opportunity to escape from their tyrants, but it would be criminal to neglect it, so that no jury could decide such a cause against the slave without contracting great guilt and incurring damnation.

Seventhly.—Should the slaves in a slave state rise in rebellion against their tyrants for the cause of liberty, the free inhabitants of that state would be as much forbidden by the moral law to take up arms to suppress that insurrection, as they are forbidden to assault and murder any of their innocent neighbors and all such as might actually fight in such a cause, in open hostility to moral justice and the rights of man, would be real murderers; and should any thus engaged in such a contest against the innocent be slain, they must inevitably sink to the bottomless pit; for, says the Scripture, no murderer has eternal life.

For the reasons now laid down, it appears that all opposers of slavery residing in slave states, who have come to a full conviction of the God-dishonoring and hell-deserving nature of slaveholding, and are conscious of the sinful entanglements to which they are liable while residing in such a situation, together with the dangers to which they or their posterity must eventually be exposed, ought to make speedy arrangements to withdraw from the tents of those wicked men, by removing to some free state, lest they be partakers of their sins, and become sharers of their plagues.

Should a slave state, in imminent danger of being overcome by an insurrection of the slaves, call upon a neighboring state for assistance, in either men, money, arms, ammunition or provisions, for the purpose of suppressing the slaves, no part of that assistnnce could be granted without contracting blood-guiltiness, nor without calling down the judgments of God upon the nation; and all such as might fall, when fighting in the defence of a cause, that could not even have the color of justice, might be expected to spend an eternity in chains and darkness, with no better company than that of slaveholders. If the Legislature of any free state should pass a law to raise troops to assist in suppressing the slaves of a slave state, when engaged in fighting for their natural rights, the citizens ought as absolutely to refuse either to take arms to fight in such a cause, or to hire substitutes, as the troops of King Saul rejected his authority, when he commanded them to slay the priests of the Lord. The command of even a lawful government cannot make it lawful for the subjects to go to war except the cause is just; if it is unjust, obedience is murder, and open rebellion against God, whose law condemns murderers under pain of death.

Query.—Could a slave state, by virtue of the Federal Constitution have a legal claim upon the Federal Government for assistance to suppress an insurrection of the slaves?

Answer.—No slave state could have any legal claim on the Federal Government for assistance to suppress an insurrection of the slaves; because slavery is directly con-

trary to the Federal Constitution; and those laws of state legislatures which ratify slavery are unconstitutional laws. The Federal Constitution declares that all men are created free, and have equal rights; therefore the Federal Government might refuse to grant the smallest assistance. They might reject a demand of this sort on the same principle that our federal courts refuse to determine causes in conformity to an unconstitutional law. That law which sanctions slavery, is not only unjust, but unconstitutional, and every attempt to suppress an insurrection of the slaves has for its object the support of an unconstitutional practice, and all attempts to help slaveholders to keep their slaves in subjection are opposed to the moral law, and to the Federal Constitution.

When it is here asserted that the Federal Constitution condemns slavery, it is not to be understood that that instrument, in its present form, contains an explicit reprehension of slavery, but it means that the foundation and ground work of the Constitution condemns the practice in the most clear and explicit form. See Declaration of Independence, page 1st: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to constitute a new government most likely to effect their safety and happiness." In the same declaration the very same reasons which are laid down to justify the independence of America, would form a juster plea for the slaves of any country to take the same measures to emancipate themselves from bondage, which the American people did to obtain their independence. In the close of this declaration, the Congress who justly style themselves the representatives of the people, bind themselves in all their future proceedings to act agrecable to these equal rights, which are here asserted. Page 7. "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine providence, we

mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honors."

Signed by order of the Congress,

JOHN HANCOCK, *President.*

CHARLES THOMPSON, *Secretary.*

That this Declaration of Independence was the foundation of the Federal Constitution, is manifest,

First.—Because the members of Congress, informing the Declaration of Independence, acted as representatives of the nation.

Second.—The Declaration of Independence exhibited the moral ground on which the nation could justify herself in acting as a political body, independent of Great Britain.

Third.—The equal rights which the nation by her representatives, had then bound herself to maintain and defend, being secured, was an encouragement to the people not only to prosecute the war with firmness, but to expect that any future form of constitution which might be adopted, would correspond with the principles of equal rights established in the Declaration of Independence.

It appears that the Declaration of Independence was the only federal constitution that existed in the United States until the articles of confederation were ratified, July 9, 1779, the third year of independence, which articles perfectly correspond with the Declaration of Independence relative to the rights of men. That instrument of confederation, now called the Federal Constitution, was not ratified until the twelfth year of American independence. It is so far from differing from the Declaration of Independence, that slavery is not once named in any of its articles. In section 9, it is said—"The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to 1803"—but whether the persons so imported were allowed to be convicts, redemptioners, or any other voluntary servants, is not said; but one thing is certain, they are not called slaves, neither could the migration of slaves be tolerated by the Constitution in any way consistent with the Declaration of Independence, which was its foundation. Suppose that clause should be so construed as to tolerate the importation of servants under bonds

for debt, or redemptioners, it will not authorise the importation of slaves, to be subject to unmerited, hereditary slavery.

Under article 4, section 2, it is said—"No person held to service or labor in any state under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered upon the claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." The design of this section was to protect the legislative authorities of all the individual states over their respective subjects, by preventing any one state from making laws relative to servants, which might prevent the free operation of the laws of any other state, and allow to each government a right and power of determining all causes in which its own people were peculiarly implicated. This section by no means recognizes the practice of holding men in a state of unmerited bondage, as being morally just, yet it seems to imply a kind of timid recognition of slavery as being politically right. If slaveholding is morally wrong, agreeable to the Declaration of Independence, it cannot be morally right for one state to deliver up the fugitive slaves of another, to be again subject to unjust bondage.

Secondly.—Can a gospel minister faithfully discharge his duty without testifying against slavery?

Answer.—It is impossible for a gospel minister to discharge his official duty in its full extent without pointing out the whole duty of man, and reprobating every thing that is dishonoring to God, and ruinous to the souls of men. Therefore, in order to discharge his duty to God, and also to acquit his own conscience, he is bound both in public and in private to testify against slavery. A minister's duty is not only to preach to sinners deliverance from eternal condemnation, but also to show the necessity of salvation from the habit and practice of sin, without which no one can enter the kingdom of God, and in particular to testify against the practice of slaveholding, as well as against every other flagrant violation of the moral law; neither is there any other method so likely to bring about general emancipation of the slaves. Had all denominations of Christians in our nation, proceeded in this way, at

the commencement of American independence, and continued their faithful exertions until this time, there would have been no occasion in our day for that disagreeable distinction in the American republic, of free states and slave states.

Secondly.—There is a time which calls forth the honest exertions of an ambassador of Christ, in dealing with the minds and consciences of men, more loudly than any other season; that is, when a slaveholder is about to take his departure from time, and appear before the tribunal of God, when a minister is called upon to visit such a person, in that solemn crisis, his indispensable duty is to deal honestly with him, and like a skilful physician to probe his wounds to the bottom; he ought to treat him with the same heroic boldness as Eli did Ahab, or that prophet who faithfully reproved king Ama for his gross idolatry. With peculiar energy he ought to lay before him the unparalleled aggravation of the crime of slaveholding, his absolute need of faith, repentance, and reformation, without which he cannot expect to enter the kingdom of God. That instead of departing out of time, by entailing unmerited, hereditary bondage upon his neighbors, he is bound by the law and the prophets to love them as himself, and show forth his love by setting them at liberty. He may lay before him the vast extent of the Divine law, its spirituality and holiness, and direct him to compare these with his own heart and life, and in particular his keeping his fellow creatures in bondage, without giving them what is just and equal according to their labor, together with the other evils which are necessarily attached to slavery, but especially to show him the inconceivable wretchedness that soul must experience in the eternal world, that has departed this life with not only the aggravations of guilt, which are common to human life, but in the commission of a crime, which grants a charter to his own posterity to continue in the perpetration of the same to the end of the world, while it entails bondage and wretchedness upon the present generation of slaves, and also upon their posterity to the end of time. He may show them that if transient acts of wickedness will subject a sinner to the vengeance of hell-fire, how inconceivably dreadful must the condition be of that man, who in his expiring moments, commits a

crime that lives in its effects and actual operation, by an arithmetical progression with his own posterity to the day of judgment, and in its bitter consequences upon the slaves to the same period. He may show him also that the sin of ratifying those dreadful entailments has one peculiar trait, which will prodigiously augment its criminality, that is the easy and ready way of getting rid of both the sin and the punishment which is the insertion of one item in his last will that will liberate all his slaves; this itself cuts off the possibility of hereditary sinning from his own posterity to the end of the world, and hereditary bondage from the blacks to the end of the world.

Sin committed is liable to be more or less aggravating in proportion to the easiness of the opposite duty required, as well as by the enormity of the effects liable to be produced by the sin. And that man who is faithfully instructed and made acquainted with the easiness of performing a duty of so high importance as that of liberating his slaves, and thereby preventing his own posterity from a course of hereditary sinning, and the slaves from hereditary misery, and will deliberately leave the world with those shocking entailments upon both, ought to go into perdition; neither can any ordinary berth in that region of despair, be adapted to his enormous guilt.

With what peculiar emphasis then, might the poet have applied these lines to the future condition of a slaveholder:

Unheard of tortures are reserved for such:
These herd together, the common damn'd shun their society.
Looking on themselves as fiends less foul. BLAIR.

SOLILOQUY FOR A DYING SLAVEHOLDER.

I am now in a little time to appear in the presence of the great God, to give an account of all the actions of my life, and to be rewarded according to my works. If my works are those of faith in the merits of Christ, for my justification, and for my deliverance from the habit and practice of sin, and if I love God and my neighbor as myself, I shall receive a crown of glory as a reward of grace. But if I am found by the great Judge, to be wanting in faith and love to God, and of that love to my neighbor which would lead me to do for him what I would that

he should do to me, I may expect, in a short time, to lift mine eyes in hell. All my black people are my neighbors; I must dispose of them in some form, that will be liable to fix their destiny in this world, after I shall have begun to experience the realities of eternity. I must either set them at liberty, or else rivet the chains of hereditary slavery upon them. How shall I dispose of them in a way conformable to that precept—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? I am in a great strait; my mind, now on the brink of eternity, reels to and fro. If I depart this life with any one prevailing lust unmortified, I must perish for ever; for the divine word shews that except I cut off right-hand sins, and pluck out right-eye sins, I cannot enter the kingdom of God.

A very weighty business now lies before me. Whether I shall, in my last will, leave those my domestics bond or free. Leaving them bound will empower my own posterity to retain them in bondage for ever; this will imply a charter to all generations, to be doing either good or evil; one of the two it must be. These blacks must also be subject to hereditary slavery with its complicated horrors to the end of time, and these miseries must be extended to all branches of their posterity, though they should amount to millions.

Their gross ignorance will be liable to prevent them from a knowledge of the gospel, and obstruct their salvation. If I should set them at liberty it would tend to unlock the bars of ignorance, which lie in their way to happiness, both temporal and eternal, and cut off all the miseries of slavery from them and their posterity for ever. But should I set them at liberty, it may, in a measure, reduce my widow and fatherless children to want. When I take a serious view of the station I at this moment occupy in the moral world, I tremble at myself. My responsibility to God relative to my slaves, is truly awful. I now possess a power above the control of all men, by one act, to prevent my own posterity, to the end of the world, from enslaving them and their children. By the same act I can secure liberty to these slaves and their posterity for ever, and therewith prevent all the miseries of slavery. All these wonderful effects, which are of infinite importance,

I can instantly accomplish by having one item inserted in my last will, to liberate the slaves I now possess, and this will secure freedom to all their succeeding generations; on the contrary, I possess a power, independent of all men, to give to my posterity a charter to continue them in slavery, with all its horrors, to the end of time. I can, without being accountable to men, decide this great and important cause as I will; yet in whatever way I determine the matter, I must be accountable to God for it. Let me summon all my deliberative faculties in this portentous crisis, and come to a final determination. Can I now appeal to God, with all the solemnity of an oath, as I shall in a few hours answer to him, that I believe it to be my indispensable duty to rivet the chains of unmerited hereditary slavery, with all its concomitant miseries, upon these my fellow creatures and neighbors, to the end of time, and empower my children, and their children's children, to be executors of that deed. And can I, in consequence of this important transaction, look forward with a well grounded hope of receiving a gracious congratulation relative to this deed—"Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord?" I cannot; it is impossible. Let me then commit my wife and children to the care and protection of a merciful God, who has promised to be the orphan's stay, and the widow's judge; for it is better for them to fall into the hands of the Lord, than into the hands of slaves. I will now, while in the land of the living and place of repentance, set them all at liberty, and at once open a way for the deliverance of them and their posterity from ignorance and wretchedness, to the end of the world, and prevent my own posterity, for ever, from exercising tyranny over them: so help me God.

The affecting scene of a dying slaveholder, bequeathing his estate to his heirs, is so well represented by a judicious writer on the subject of slavery, that we shall transcribe his statement verbatim. To see a man, (a Christian,) in the most serious part of his life, making his last will and testament, and in the most solemn manner addressing the judge of all the earth—"In the name of God, *Amen*."

Hearken to him; he certainly must be in earnest. He

is closing all his concerns here below. He will very shortly appear before the Judge, where kings and slaves will have equal thrones.

He proceeds—

Item. I give and bequeath to my son a negro man, named a negro woman, named with five of her young children.

Item. I give and bequeath to my daughter a negro man, named also a negro woman named with her three children.

Item. All my other slaves, whether men, women, or children, with all my stock of horses, cattle, sheep, and hogs, I direct to be sold to the highest bidder, and the monies arising therefrom, (after paying my just debts,) to be equally divided between my two above named children.

Suppose, for a moment, that the testator, or if the owner dies intestate, (which is often the case,) was ever so humane a person, who can vouch for his heirs and successors? This consideration, if nothing else, ought to make all slaveholders take heed what they do, for they must give an account of themselves to God. BARROW.

CHAPTER XII.

PRACTICAL IMPROVEMENT.

The reader will perceive that the present work is not a sermon; yet, as the general subject is of a most serious nature, so as deeply to concern the eternal states of men, it may not be amiss to conclude with a practical improvement.

I. From what has been said of the real character of a slaveholder—how his authority over his slaves contravenes the authority of God's law relative to the slaves, and intercepts and prevents all relative duties between husbands and wives, parents and children, and turns the entire system of obedience due from the slaves, both to God and man, into a channel of honor and profit to himself—it appears that SLAVEHOLDER, considered as a term expressive of his station, office, and usurped authority, is a name of

blasphemy, and, like that of the Devil, ought not to be mentioned but with horror, and when imperious necessity requires it.

II. From the view that has been taken of the enormous criminality of slaveholding, let no one rashly conclude, that, in the great scale of providential events, it is so far a nuisance in the moral world, as to answer no good purpose; for, upon mature consideration, it will be found to answer some valuable ends, both to display the justice of God, and to elucidate some of the other great doctrines of Divine revelation.

In the whole volume of Divine providence, there is no one thing which shows the absolute necessity of a hell, more than the practice of involuntary, unmerited, hereditary slavery. This will appear,

First—From the aggravation of the crime. The peculiar aggravation of the crime lies, not so much in hard treatment of the slaves, as in the station, office, and power of the slaveholder; all of which he voluntarily usurps, and entails hereditary bondage upon the slaves to the end of the world. The slaveholder may withhold a due allowance of food and clothing; but facts of this kind are only transient evils. He may abuse them by stripes, bruises, and maiming; but all these are transient acts of injustice. But to hold men in a state of slavery, and entail it upon them and their posterity to the end of the world, if he was to treat him ever so well in his own time, is that in which the most deadly criminality lies. The effects of transient acts of injustice are liable to be transient; but this lives, in its tremendous effects, long after the slaveholder is dead. So that if the wisdom of angels was employed for ages, in search of epithets to depict the shocking nature of that sin, they would come far short of their object; yea, if they were to range heaven, earth, and hell for metaphors, tropes, and figures, to express its multifarious horrors, they must still fall short. It would be like an attempt to measure eternity by an addition of finite periods; therefore, the peculiar aggravation of the crime is an evidence of the certainty of a hell.

Secondly—Agreeable to the laws of every slave state the owners of slaves are in no respect (with a very few

exceptions) amenable to any human laws for their conduct towards their slaves; but may rob them of ther liberty, their children, their wages, may beat and abuse them at pleasure, and trample upon all their natural rights and natural relations, and, by their authority, supersede all moral obligations arising from these relations, and, in their last will, entail all that complication of miseries upon their posterity to perpetual generations. Therefore, when we look upon slaveholding as an assemblage of all the most capital outrages upon moral justice that can come under our inspection, and consider that the conduct of those tyrants, throughout the whole, is entirely out of the reach of justice in this world, it is a most striking and conspicuous evidence of the certainty of a hell, that slaveholders and all such as escape the justice of God administered by man in this world may meet with a due reward from the hand of God in the world to come.

Thirdly—Slaveholding is an amplification of the Scriptural doctrine of the fall of man For when we take a view of the monstrous injustice, cruelty, and the abuse of every moral relation subsisting in the human family, implied in the practice, and all in open hostility to the very light of nature, as well as divine revelation, we may at once conclude, that this cannot be man's primitive state, as he came from the hands of a holy God. But man's nature is depraved, and the state of bondage and wretchedness in which the slaves are placed correspond therewith, and exemplifies the truth of that Scripture, the misery of man is great upon him.

III. Slaveholding, considered in its nature and tendency, affords a notable argument to prove the infinite evil of sin. Sin is said to be an infinite evil, not from the quantity of the action, but from its tendency to dishonor God's infinite character; so the infinite evil of slaveholding is not estimated by the quantity of the act, but by its tendency, which is infinite.

When a slaveholder, by his last will, leaves his slaves in a state of hereditary bondage, his crime, in the first instance, has the same essential properties of an infinite evil with any other sin: but, as it relates to futurity, its evil tendency is infinite, in a manner peculiar to itself. As,

First—It entails a course of perpetual sinning on his posterity, as he leaves his slaves in their possession, with a right and power to entail the same authority to their children, and so on *ad infinitum*. Thus, in his last will, he gives to his posterity a charter and power to continue the crime to the end of the world. It will not prevent the evil from being infinite in its nature and tendency, that some of the succeeding generations may cut off the entailment by setting the slaves at liberty; because the object of his last will, and the power that it conveyed to his posterity, was to entail bondage upon them to the end of the world.

This entailment being cut off by the end of the world, will not change the nature and tendency of the act of entailing implied in the slaveholder's last will; because, if there was to be a succession of generations to eternity, it could make no difference as to the act of entailing: because, if by his last will he can fix the entailment upon the first generation that succeeds him, he may equally fix the entailment upon all succeeding generations, and if the succession was to be endless, it would be the same: therefore, the moral tendency of slaveholding is, to establish in the slaveholder's posterity a succession of sinning, and that of the highest aggravation, to all eternity.

Secondly—It entails a curse of perpetual misery upon the slaves, so that the infinite evil of the sin of slaveholding may be proved from its tendency in relation to the slaves upon whom the effects of the sin fall; so that all their ignorance of God, and all their wickedness and defilement of speech and behavior which natively flow from their ignorance, and all the miseries which belong to a state of slavery, are by his deed entailed upon them, and all that complication of horrors, both moral and natural, he entails upon all generations; and if the generations were to continue to eternity, it would be the same: so that the man who, at his death, leaves his slaves in bondage, commits sin that empowers his posterity to repeat the same crime to all eternity. It is also a moral ground, to cause an eternal punishment to be inflicted upon the innocent, who are not supposed, even by the slaveholders themselves, to merit such treatment. They are the trans-

gressors, while the punishment comes upon the innocent. Who then could suppose that slaveholders would attempt to deny the infinite evil of sin, or dispute the eternity of punishment, while, by their own practice, they give such notable examples of both? Yet it is no uncommon thing to find slaveholders most avowed enemies to the infinite evil of sin, and to the doctrine of eternal punishment.

But the highest evidence of the infinite evil of slaveholding, is its tendency to cause the eternal damnation of all that are enslaved. Ignorance of every branch of literature is a necessary appendage of slavery, which implies an utter unacquaintance with God's word, and this prevents them from a knowledge of their lost condition by nature as guilty and depraved, and from a knowledge of the method of justification through faith in Christ, and of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, without which none can be saved.

The word of God binds all heads of families to instruct their families in the knowledge of that word, and shews that all who neglect this duty must be exposed to the wrath of God. But how great must be their guilt and exposure to Divine vengeance who will neither instruct the ignorant themselves, nor suffer them to be taught; and although the holder of slaves should be ever so faithful in teaching the generation that are immediately under his inspection, if at his death he entails hereditary bondage upon them, he does his utmost to entail ignorance upon them to the end of the world, or to shut them out from a knowledge of acceptance through faith in Jesus Christ.—Ezek. iii. 18: "When I say unto the wicked thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way to save his life, the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand." The slaves are both wicked and grossly ignorant, while their cruel tyrants will neither instruct them themselves, nor suffer them to be instructed by others, in order that they might forsake their evil ways and live, but entail ignorance upon them to perpetual generations; and if a succession of generations was to continue to eternity, the act of entailing bondage upon them would naturally tend to

subject them all to ignorance, and occasion their eternal condemnation; and farther, the posterity of the slaves which are left in bondage by the last will of the testator are liable to multiply to infinity, which will naturally occasion an infinity of eternal penalties, in proportion to the number of subjects. A slaveholder, then, who by his last will and testament leaves his slaves in bondage, commits a crime that tends to produce an eternity of sinning with his own posterity, an eternity of slavery to the blacks, an eternity of damnation to them, and an infinity of eternal penalties. If all these infinities of evils are native consequences of his last will and testament, what idea can be formed of the eternal state of the testator himself.

GRADUALISM.

The foregoing investigation of slavery has been restricted to perpetual hereditary slavery. But there is another branch of slavery which is practised in some states, which though of less aggravation, partakes of the same kind of moral turpitude with the former; it is that of holding the blacks in bondage, until they arrive at the age of 28 years. This practice, when compared with the other, must be less criminal, and is liable to afford some relief to the oppressed.

But it seems to resemble the practice of some thieves, who content themselves with pilfering articles of little value, and small sums of money, but have not courage to rob on the highway. The evils of this partial degree of slavery, are the following:

First—The slaves are kept in ignorance as well as bondage, until they arrive to the age of 28.

Second—They are robbed of seven years of time, of liberty and the profits of their labor.

If it is lawful to hold a man in bondage until he is twenty-eight years of age, it must be equally lawful to hold him to the day of his death; and if it is sinful to hold him to the day of his death, it must partake of the same species of crime, to hold him until he is twenty-eight.

Again; that part of human life which lies between the years of 21 and 28, is that period in which marriages are

apt to be contracted, and families begin to increase, while all children born to parents in a state of bondage, must remain under bonds until the same periods in which their parents are allowed to go free, to wit: the females at 25, and the males at 28; the blacks then lose that part of their time which is the most proper to cultivate their minds with useful learning, and to lay up something for the support of their families. But when persons pass the age of twenty-eight, without learning and without any property, they are not liable to make proficiency in the acquisition of either.

Third—The holders of such slaves, having no prospect of deriving any profit from them after their 28th year, are liable, not only to entirely neglect their education, but also to treat them with great severity, in order to extort from them as much profit as they possibly can, before the time of their emancipation.

On account then, of 28 years of slavery, and the ignorance and degradation which are consequences of it; on account also of the loss of seven years, at a time most favorable to receive the rudiments of education, and to prepare something for the support of families, we cannot expect that a law which emancipates the slaves at the age of 28 years, and will admit of their being kept in ignorance and misery to that time, will do much to promote either the temporal or eternal happiness of the blacks.

CONCLUSION.

Let all the warm and zealous friends of emancipation take heed to themselves, and examine their own hearts as to the foundations they are building upon for eternal life. Although slaveholding will without repentance and reformation take a man to hell, a warm zeal and active service in the business of emancipation will not take a man to heaven. By the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified. If our zeal and activity in the cause of emancipation, is joined with a faith's reliance on the atoning sacrifice of Christ, for the justification of our persons, a regard to the word of God, as a rule of duty and a dependence on the Holy Spirit for strength to lead holy lives, and that agreeable to the Divine rule, we do actually lead holy

lives—lives of habitual conformity to the will of God, and faithfulness towards men; then our persons and services will be acceptable in the sight of God, and in particular our zeal and activity in the cause of emancipation will be accepted as a pleasing sacrifice, and great will be our reward in heaven. But on the contrary, if our religion consists chiefly in contending for civil liberty in opposition to the tyranny of slaveholders, while we remain unconcerned for the spiritual liberty of our own souls, and regardless of a holy life, we may expect without fail to have our part and portion with slaveholders, through the lasting ages of eternity. But what will still add to our degradation, we will not then occupy even the rank of slaveholders, but it will be that of slaves—slaves to the devil, and be bound in the chains of eternal justice, to suffer a just retribution for our aggravated guilt, and in particular for our abuse of that liberty, for which we have so zealously contended in behalf of others.

THE NEGRO.

And shall the beams of science never shed,
Their light benign upon the negro's head,
Or is he destined still through life to roam,
Bereft of hope beyond the silent tomb.

Far from his home, across the Atlantic deep,
To foreign climes, by rude oppression borne,
The negro toils, and oft in silence weeps,
Weeps for those joys, that never more return.

Perhaps a sire, perhaps a mother dear,
Now deeply drain the bitter cup of wo,
For their dear child, starts forth the trickling tear,
For him, their son, their ceaseless sorrows flow.

Hard is that heart that thus without a sigh,
To slavery's chains, his fellow man condemns,
Forms not his mind to range the spheres on high,
But leaves it deep in hopeless gloom o'erwhelmed.

O must his toughts survey no brighter skies,
Where pleasures dwell, where endless glories rise,
Where the Redeemer sits enthroned above,
In realms of light, the home of bliss and love.

O when will every clime and every plain,
Be cheer'd by liberty's endearing ray,
When will strict justice force its righteous claim,
And mercy mild, resume its long lost sway.

Columbia speak, let slavery's dirge be sung
Wide o'er the world. The joyful sound begun,
Shall bid the age of crime and suff'ring cease,
And hail the reign of freedom and of peace.

HARP OF INDIANA.

APPENDIX.

The foregoing view of slavery is by no means the effect of prejudice, against slaveholders in general, or against any individuals of that class of citizens. The writer never had any ground of complaint against them, of a personal nature, but on the contrary has had experience of as polite treatment from slaveholders as from any others with whom he has been conversant; but in reflecting on the civilities of slaveholders towards himself, compared with their treatment of the slaves, he has been led seriously to inquire into the fundamental reason of the strange disparity, and put the question to himself, "What is the reason these people treat me with so much kindness, while it cannot be in return for any service I have ever done to them. It cannot be because my complexion is white, while that of the Africans is black, for we find persons among them in a state of slavery of all shades of color, from the deepest black down to such a degree of white, that a tinge of African blood can hardly be discovered. The blacks are daily doing them service, but they neither make them a just restitution, nor show them any civilities. This seems like inverting the order of moral equity. Their politeness to me, and harshness to the slaves, cannot be attributed to a supreme regard to the law of God as a general rule of duty, for that requires justice before liberality; neither can it arise from a principle of obedience to that second great command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" for that command would lead them to act impartially to all both black and white. I then conclude that this kind treatment must

arise from self love or a wish to have a great name, for persons of much liberality and great benevolence, and also to display their own magnificence. Therefore, the great reason why they do not hold me in the same condition of wretchedness with their slaves, is because I am not in their power, but had they an opportunity of subjecting me to the same servile and degraded condition with their slaves, they would, without fail, do it.

LAWS OF KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA RELATIVE TO SLAVERY.

Vol. 2, chap. 63, section 2—"No negro or mulatto shall be a witness, except in plea of the commonwealth against negroes or mulattoes, or in civil pleas, where negroes or mulattoes alone shall be parties." This law though essential to the existence of slavery is directly opposed to the right of man, and to the moral law, which binds every man according to his knowledge of facts, to bear witness in defence of the innocent, and for the conviction of the guilty; this is a duty which all men owe to both God and their neighbors."

Levit. v. 1: "And if a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, and is witness whether he hath seen or known of it, if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity." Proverbs xxxi. 8, 9: "Open thy mouth for the dumb in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction, open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy." When the slaves are rendered incapable of bearing testimony in a cause pending before a court, they cannot bear the iniquity, but it devolves with peculiar weight upon the heads of those that prevent them.

Section 3. "No slaves shall go from the tenements of his master or other person with whom he lives without a pass, or some letter or token whereby it may appear that he is proceeding by authority from his master or employer; if he does, it shall be lawful for any person to apprehend and carry him before a justice of the peace, to be by his order punished with stripes or not, in his discretion."

Section 4. "And if any slave shall presume to come and be upon the plantation of any person whatsoever, without leave in writing from his or her owner or over-

seer, not being sent on lawful business, it shall be lawful for the owner or overseer of such plantation to give or order such slave ten lashes, on his or her bare back, for every such offence."

Suppose a slave had a desire, and found himself bound by the law of God to go to visit some of his sick or dying friends, he could not without permission from his master. Suppose the slaves in a neighborhood to feel themselves bound by the law of God to meet together for the purpose of social worship, they could not do it without permission from their masters or overseers. But for a human creature to be under the necessity of asking permission from man to worship God, is an affront offered to the majesty of God, and the sin lies at the master's door. If the slaves were to attempt the duty without permission, they would be exposed to the cruelty of their persecutors; yet it would undoubtedly be their duty to act in such a case as Daniel did, who in the face of persecution, worshiped God, and left the event to himself. Dan. vi. 10.

For any man wilfully to occupy the station of a slave-master, assuming that power with which such are invested by these two sections of law, so as to have an absolute power to restrain or tolerate the religious exercises of his fellow creatures at his pleasure, is to exalt himself above the God of heaven.

Section 5. "No negro, mulatto, or Indian whatsoever, shall keep or carry any gunpowder, shot, club, or other weapon whatsoever, offensive or defensive, but all and every gun, weapon and ammunition found in the possession or custody of any negro, mulatto, or Indian, may be seized by any person; and upon due proof made before any justice of the peace of the county where such seizure shall be, shall, by his order, be forfeited to the seizer for his own use; and moreover, every such offender shall have and receive, by order of such justice, any number of lashes not exceeding thirty-nine, on his or her back, well laid on, for every such offence."

Agreeable to this section, the most palpable robbery, the most undisguised cruelty and atrocious covetousness are all established by law, which will preclude every conscientious Christian from ever officiating as a justice of

the peace, a constable, sheriff, or judge of a court, in any slave state where such laws exist; and exist they must wherever slavery exists.

It appears that among the whole black list of hell-deserving crimes in our world, no one will establish a man's title to perdition with greater certainty than slaveholding, yet every sin has its appendages as well as slavery. If sin must be defended or supported, it can only be done by sin. Slaveholding is a most heinous sin. Hence all laws which are made to support it are sinful; yet all are essential to the permanent existence of slavery in any state.

The seventh section prohibits, by a heavy fine, every head of a family from admitting his neighbor's slave to be or remain on his premises more than four hours at a time, without permission from the owner or overseer. And every owner or overseer is by the same act made liable to pay a heavy fine, who will suffer more than five slaves, other than his own, to be or remain on his plantation at any one time.

The next section grants indulgence to the slaves to meet together on the Lord's day, if licensed in writing by their masters or overseers.

As these two acts imply the essence of tyranny, so they put a final stop to any successful methods of teaching the slaves in schools, whether on the Sabbath or any other day, and make the master to be the entire director of the slave's religion; for they cannot meet together for the worship of God without a written license from the master or overseer.

The tenth section subjects every white person to a fine of fifteen shillings, or twenty lashes well laid on, if found in company with slaves, at any unlawful meeting, or that shall harbor or entertain any slave, without the consent of the owner. Agreeable to this section, no minister of the gospel can preach to a congregation of blacks, without exposing himself to persecution, because any number of slaves above five, is an unlawful meeting. See sect. 10.

The next section lays all justices, sheriffs, and consta bes, under heavy penalties, who will fail to suppress all unlawful meetings of the slaves.

The twelfth section prohibits all free persons to buy, sell, or receive any coin or commodity from a slave, without the consent of the owner or overseer, under the penalty of four times the value of the article bought, sold or received, with costs of action upon the case.

Section 13. "If any negro, mulatto or Indian, bond or free, shall at any time lift his or her hand in opposition to any person not being a negro, mulatto or Indian, he or she so offending, shall for every such offence, proved by the oath of the party before a justice of the peace of the county where such offence shall be committed, receive thirty lashes, on his or her bare back, well laid on, by order of such justice."

This law makes no allowance for self-defence, in the case of a negro lifting his hand, neither does it make a difference between lifting the hand in a mere threatening attitude, and that of actually striking a blow, nor any allowance on account of the character or behavior of the person against whom he may lift his hand; but the negro is liable to be insulted by the vilest miscreants, to be struck and trampled upon by impudent children, and vile drunkards, without the privilege of defending himself.

The eighteenth section provides, that in consequence of a slave being duly convicted of a capital crime, thirty days shall be allowed him, between his sentence and execution, except in cases of conspiracy, insurrection or rebellion, that is, except he should be convicted of some one or more of those acts of bravery, which would, if committed by his judges, entitle them to the highest applause, were they in the condition of slaves in Africa.

By an act of the Virginia legislature in 1804, all night meetings of the blacks were prohibited, but afterwards in a revised code may be seen an amendment, to the following import:

"Nothing in the said act shall prevent the master or overseer of slaves, from carrying, or permitting his, her or their slave or slaves, to go with him, her or them, or with any part of his, her or their family, to any place for the purpose of religious worship, provided that such worship be conducted by a regularly ordained white minister."

This act implies bloody persecution in its whole structure.

First—The slaves are restrained from meeting together, for public worship, except some of their tyrants are with them.

Second—They are liable to be prevented, for the most part, from ever enjoying the privilege of attending public worship, for this reason, that slave tyrants are not apt to be in the habit of attending places of public worship, but are liable to spend their Sabbaths in idleness and recreations.

Third—If the slaves should thus be permitted to attend upon public worship, they must of necessity be governed by their master's views of religion, in respect to the doctrine taught by the preacher. The amount of the whole matter is, that except the slaves can in conscience agree with their master's religious system, they must by force be restrained from all public ordinances.

Fourth—If the preacher should not be a white man, however sound in the faith, able in doctrine, and profitable in his public administrations, they must not show themselves among his hearers, either with their masters or without them. All these restrictions are most open and undisguised restraints on the consciences of men; and if the slaves should refuse submission to the inquisitorial acts by attempting to worship God agreeable to the dictates of their own consciences, they would first be put to the torture. Should they still persist in their integrity, they would be liable to suffer death.

Many slaveholders grant that to hold men in slavery is wrong; but sound policy makes it necessary to keep them in bondage, because of the dangerous consequences which might result from their general emancipation. But if slaveholding is a moral evil, no supposed consequences will justify a continuance of the practice. We might as well argue that because a man has fled from society for robbery and murder he is in duty bound to continue those practices for his support, lest if he appear in public he will be liable to be brought to justice. God's word forbids us to do evil that good may come. If this command forbids the smallest aggravation of sin to serve our worldly interest or safety, what shall we say of slaveholding, which

is the very acmé of sin, that concentrates into one focus all the most capital violations of the moral law. But we have no reason to conclude that even a general emancipation of the slaves would occasion any insurmountable difficulties, while a God of providence governs the world; but although universal devastation was to be the certain consequence of a general emancipation, it would be infinitely better to suffer in our bodies and estates in time, than to dishonor God, and be cast soul and body into hell-fire, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

REPLY TO MR. HARRIS.

A certain Mr. Harris, who has written in favor of slavery, makes use of the fact related in the 47th chapter of Genesis to justify the practice of slavery. Verse 23: "Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh. Lo, here is food for you, and ye shall sow the land, and it shall come to pass in the increase, that you shall give the fifth part unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own for seed of the field, for your food and for them of your household, and for food for your little ones. And they said, Thou hast saved our lives, let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants. And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part, except the land of the priests, which became not Pharaoh's."

From the narrative of this transaction, it is evident, 1. That Joseph's purchase of the Egyptians for Pharaoh did not make them slaves to him, but only tenants. 2. Joseph in this whole transaction acted as an agent for Pharaoh; what he did was not to aggrandize himself, but its ultimate tendency related to the king and his subjects. 3. When he established the rent of the land at one-fifth of the increase, Pharaoh was equally bound to let them have their lands for the fifth, and had no power to exact more, and this covenant between Pharaoh and his subjects was made binding to perpetual generations, as the words in verse 26 show: "And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day." 4. It is evident that one-fifth

was all the tribute that the renters of lands were obliged to pay to the king, which when collected from all parts of the empire would make a revenue sufficient to support the government.

We shall now inquire whether this new financial scheme tended to injure or to promote the general welfare of the nation; and, first, it established upon a permanent foundation an ample support to government.

Secondly—It secured to the people from generation to generation a competent support, by establishing to them an inalienable right to four-fifths of the increase of the lands, and thus prevented them from ever being subject to the mercy of oppressive landlords. It is a well known fact that the lands of all countries which are long inhabited, become the exclusive property of an opulent few, while the great mass of the people become renters, and that the rule by which land-holders let their fields or farms to individuals, is not by the intrinsic value of the increase, or what they may lawfully exact from the renter, but what is the highest he can pay consistent with his bare subsistence. In many parts of the United States it is common for renters to pay one-half the increase of the soil; but in most of European countries, after rents are paid, toll, tribute and custom discharged, most of renters would count themselves very safe if they could save one-fifth. Joseph's plan, while it restrained the power of the king from ever demanding more than the fifth, it secured the people against the unbounded avarice of landlords. The king was landlord of the whole, and he was bound by an established rule, beyond which he could not go.

Thus it appears that Joseph's method of buying the Egyptians and their lands, was so far from enslaving them, that it was the wisest plan that ever was or could be invented to secure them against being slaves either to the king or to one another; and it is highly probable that the establishment of this wise scheme was the cause that Egypt at an early period excelled all other kingdoms in wealth, power and learning, and an experience of its happy effects might have been a reason why the Egyptians deified Joseph after his death.